arXiv:1702.07895v2 [math.PR] 2 Apr 2017

RANDOM SORTING NETWORKS: LOCAL STATISTICS VIA RANDOM MATRIX LAWS

VADIM GORIN AND MUSTAZEE RAHMAN

Abstract. This paper derives the bulk local limit of the swap process of uniformly random sorting networks. The limit object is defined through a deterministic procedure, a local version of the Edelman-Greene algorithm, applied to a two dimensional determinantal point process with explicit kernel. The latter describes the asymptotic joint law near 0 of the eigenvalues of the corners in the antisymmetric Gaussian Unitary Ensemble. In particular, the limiting distribution of the first swap time at a given position is identified with the limiting distribution for the closest to 0 eigenvalue in the antisymmetric GUE.

The proofs rely on the determinantal structure and a double contour integral representation for the kernel of random Poissonized Young tableaux.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Overview.** The main object of this article is the uniformly random sorting network, as introduced by Angel, Holroyd, Romik and Virág in [AHRV]. Let $S(n)$ denote the symmetric group and τ_i denote the transposition between i and $i+1$ for $1 \le i \le n-1$. The τ_i are called *adjacent swaps*. Let $\mathrm{rev} = n, n-1, \dots, 1$ denote the reverse permutation of $S(n)$. A sorting network of $S(n)$ is a sequence of permutations $\sigma_0 = \mathrm{id}, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{\mathrm{N}} = \mathrm{rev}$ of shortest length with the property that for every k, $\sigma_{k+1} = \sigma_k \circ \tau_i$ for some i. In other words, the permutations change by swapping adjacent labels at each step and must go from the identity to the reverse in the shortest number of swaps. The number of adjacent swaps required in any sorting network of $S(n)$ is $N = \binom{n}{2}$. See Figure 1 for an example of a sorting network in the wiring diagram representation. Let Ω_n denote the set of sorting networks of $S(n)$. We identify a sorting network $\omega \in \Omega_n$ by its sequence of swaps: $\omega = (s_1, \dots, s_N)$, where s_i denotes the adjacent swap (s_i, s_i+1).

The *random sorting network* of size n is an element of Ω_n chosen uniformly at random. Computer simulations display many beautiful asymptotic properties of random sorting networks as $n \to \infty$ for which there is little proven rigorously. See [AHRV] for an account of these conjectures and the first rigorous results and also [AH, AGH, AHR, RVV, KV, ADHV, Ro] for other asymptotic theorems.

In many examples, random combinatorial structures built out of the symmetric groups are known to exhibit the same asymptotic behavior as random matrices. The most famous result of this sort due to Baik–Deift–Johansson [BDJ] identifies the fluctuations of longest increasing subsequences of random permutations to the fluctuations of largest eigenvalue of random Hermitian matrices. Its further upgrades [BOO, J, O] link fluctuations of several first rows of the Young diagram distributed according to the Plancherel measure for symmetric groups to those

Key words and phrases. Sorting network, reduced decomposition, local limit, GUE corners, Young tableau.



FIGURE 1. Wiring diagram of a sorting network of $S(5)$ with swap sequence (2,4,3,1,2,1,4,3,2,4). Intersection of two paths at location $(i-1/2, j+1/2)$ indicates a swap at time i between labels at positions j and $j+1$. The intersection locations (red crosses) of a random sorting network of $S(n)$ has a weak limit in windows of unit order in the vertical direction and order n in the horizontal direction.

of several largest eigenvalues. A connection also exists for "bulk" (i.e. not largest) rows and eigenvalues, see [BOO].

On the other hand, up to now no such connections were known for the random sorting networks. In the present article we find such a connection. As the above discussion hints, the connection might exist for some sort of a local limit. And indeed, we find the bulk local limit of random sorting networks, by proving that it is given by a simple local deterministic algorithm applied to a specific random point process on $\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{R}$. In turn, we describe this point process by showing that its correlation functions have determinantal form, and providing explicit expressions for the corresponding correlation kernel. The very same point process appeared before in the work of Forrester–Nordenstam [FN] (see also Deffoseux [D]) as the hard edge limit of antisymmetric GUE–corners process; it describes the asymptotic distribution of the closest to 0 eigenvalues of the corners of large antisymmetric matrix with i.i.d. (modulo symmetry) Gaussian entries of mean 0.

The simplest one-dimensional marginal of our theorem claims that the asymptotic distribution of the rescaled first time when a swap at position $\frac{\alpha+1}{2}\cdot n$, for $-1<\alpha<1$, happens is the same as the asymptotic distribution of the smallest (by absolute value) eigenvalue of antisymmetric-GUE random matrix. The complete statement is given in the next section.

In an independent parallel work Angel, Dauvergne, Holroyd, and Virág [ADHV] also study the bulk local limits of random sorting networks. Their approach is very different from ours. We deduce explicit formulas for the prelimit local structure of the sorting networks, and then analyze the asymptotic of these formulas in the spirit of *Integrable Probability*, see [BG, BP]. On the other hand, [ADHV] argue probabilistically, analyzing the hook walk random algorithm for sampling random Young tableaux. One consequence is that the connection to random matrices remains invisible in the results of [ADHV]. It would be interesting to match the two approaches, but it has not been done so far.

1.2. **Bulk limit of the random sorting networks.** We describe our main result in more detail. Informally, we study the asymptotics of the point process (s_i, i), $i = 1, \dots, \binom{n}{2}$, in a window of finite height and order n width, so that the number of points in the window remains finite; see Figure 1. Here $(s_1, \dots, s_{\binom{n}{2}})$ are swaps of the uniformly random sorting network of size n.

In [AHRV] it is proven that the point process (s_i, i) is stationary with respect to the second coordinate. Therefore, it suffices to study the windows adjacent to 0 in second coordinate, which we do.

The limiting object S_{local} is a point process on $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ defined by a two–step procedure. First, we introduce an auxiliary point process $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ on $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$ through its correlation functions.

Definition 1.1. *$\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ is a (unique) determinantal point process on $\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{R}$ with correlation kernel*

$$K_{\text{edge}}(x_1, u_1; x_2, u_2) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{2}{\pi} \displaystyle\int_0^1 t^{x_2 - x_1} \cos\Big(tu_1 + \frac{\pi}{2} x_1\Big) \cos\Big(tu_2 + \frac{\pi}{2} x_2\Big)\, dt, & x_2 \geq x_1 \\ \\ -\dfrac{2}{\pi} \displaystyle\int_1^\infty t^{x_2 - x_1} \cos\Big(tu_1 + \frac{\pi}{2} x_1\Big) \cos\Big(tu_2 + \frac{\pi}{2} x_2\Big)\, dt, & x_2 < x_1. \end{cases}$$

We refer to [B] and Section 2.4 for more detailed discussions of determinantal point processes. We note that the particles of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ on adjacent lines $x \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $(x+1) \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ almost surely interlace, see Figure 2. The point process $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ has appeared in the random matrix literature before in [FN], [D]. In more details, let G be an infinite random matrix with rows and columns indexed by $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, and whose entries are independent and identically distributed, real-valued, standard Gaussians. Let $A = \frac{G - G^T}{\sqrt{2}}$. The top–left $m \times m$ corner of A almost surely has $2\lfloor m/2 \rfloor$ non-zero eigenvalues of the form

$$\pm \mathbf{i}\lambda_1^m, \pm \mathbf{i}\lambda_2^m, \dots, \pm \mathbf{i}\lambda_{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}^m,$$

where $0 < \lambda_1^m < \lambda_2^m < \cdots < \lambda_{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}^m$. Forrester and Nordenstam prove that $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ is the weak limit of the point process $\{(j, \sqrt{2M}\lambda_i^{2M+j})\} \subset \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ as $M \to \infty$.

Particle configurations of S_{local} are obtained from $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ by a deterministic procedure, which is a local version of the well-known Edelman–Green bijection [EG] between staircase shaped tableaux and sorting networks. In the following we describe this procedure. A rigorous definition of the procedure actually utilizes some properties of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ that are not immediate from Definition 1.1. We provide the rigorous construction in Section 6.3 where the description is given in the language of Young tableau, which is the more standard setup for defining the Edelman-Greene bijection.

Local Edelman-Greene algorithm. Fix a configuration X of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ and suppose that we want to define the positions of all particles of S_{local} inside the rectangle $[a, b] \times T$ with $a < 0 < b$. Then almost surely there are two integers $\hat{a} < 2a$ and $\hat{b} > 2b$ such that X has no particles on the segments $\hat{a} \times [0, T]$ and $\hat{b} \times [0, T]$. The particles of X outside $[\hat{a}, \hat{b}] \times [0, T]$ are further ignored.



FIGURE 2. Top: A possible configuration (red crosses) of $\mathcal{X}_{edge}$ restricted to $[-5,3]\times[0,T]$ with no particles on $\{-5,3\}\times[0,T]$. Particles on consecutive lines interlace. Encircled points represent the sliding path during the first step of the Edelman-Greene algorithm. Bottom: The result after the first step of the Edelman-Greene algorithm.

We now define a particle configuration Y – the restriction of S_{local} onto $[\hat{a},\hat{b}]\times[0,T]$ – through an iterative procedure. Start by declaring $Y=\emptyset$, and setting $\hat{X}$ to be the restriction of X onto $[\hat{a},\hat{b}]\times[0,T]$. Repeat the following until $\hat{X}$ is empty:

(1) Let (x,u) be an element of $\hat{X}$ with smallest second coordinate. The parity of x will be even. Add $(x/2,u)$ to Y, i.e., redefine $Y:=Y\cup\{(x/2,u)\}$.

(2) Define the *sliding path* $(x_1,u_1),(x_2,u_2),\dots$ as a unique collection of points in $\hat{X}$ (of maximal length) such that
- $(x_1,u_1)=(x,u)$,
- $u_1<u_2<\cdots<u_k$,
- $|x_i-x_{i+1}|=1$, for $i=1,\dots,k-1$,
- For each $i=1,\dots,k-1$, the only points of $\hat{X}$ in the rectangle $[x_i-1,x_i+1]\times[u_i,u_{i+1}]$ are (x_i,u_i) and (x_{i+1},u_{i+1}).

In other words, (x_{i+1},u_{i+1}) is the point in $[x_i-1,x_i+1]\times(u_i,T]$, which is closest to (x_i,u_i). See Figure 2 for an illustration.

(3) Remove the k points $(x_1,u_1),\dots,(x_k,u_k)$ from $\hat{X}$ and replace them by $k-1$ points $(x_1,u_2),(x_2,u_3),\dots,(x_{k-1},u_k)$.

(4) Go back to Step (1), unless $\hat{X}$ is empty.

The first coordinates of the particles of Y will be integral; this follows from the interlacing property of the particles of $\hat{X}$, which is preserved throughout the steps of the procedure.

One immediate property of the just defined map $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}} \mapsto S_{\text{local}}$ is that the position of the first particle of S_{local} in the ray $\{a\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ almost surely coincides with the position of the first particle of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ in the ray $\{2a\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Therefore, the joint law of the positions of the first particles of S_{local} in the rays $\{a_i\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, k$, can be explicitly evaluated as a Fredholm determinant. See Corollary 1.3 for the case $k = 1$ and [B] for general statements.

We also show that S_{local} is invariant under translations and reflections of the first ($\mathbb{Z}$–valued) coordinate, stationary in the second ($\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$–valued) coordinate and ergodic; see Theorem 6.7 for the specific results.

We are ready to formulate the main result.

Theorem 1.2. *Fix $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$, and let $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_{\binom{n}{2}}$ be swaps of the random sorting network of size n. Define the point process $S_{\alpha,n}$ of rescaled swaps near the point $(\frac{n(\alpha+1)}{2}, 0)$ through*

$$S_{\alpha,n} = \left\{ \left(s_i - \left\lfloor \frac{n(\alpha+1)}{2} \right\rfloor, \sqrt{1-\alpha^2} \cdot \frac{2i}{n} \right) \right\}_{i=1}^{\binom{n}{2}}.$$

Then as $n \to \infty$, the point process $S_{\alpha,n}$ weakly converges to S_{local}.

It is proven in [AHRV, Theorem 2] that the global scaling limit of the space-time swap process of random sorting networks is the product of the semicircle law and Lebesgue measure. The $\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}$ scaling of Theorem 1.2 is consistent with the semicircle result.

We emphasize that Theorem 1.2 states both that $S_{\alpha,n}$ converges and the limit is obtained by applying the localized Edelman-Greene algorithm to $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$. Theorem 1.2 does not cover the case $|\alpha| = 1$, where the asymptotic behavior changes. It is plausible that the methods of the present article can be also adapted to this remaining case, but we not address it here; see [Ro] for another approach to $|\alpha| = 1$ case.

Theorem 1.2 implies, in particular, that the first swap times in random sorting networks converge to a one–dimensional marginal of S_{local}; the distribution of the latter can be expressed as a Fredholm determinant. Figure 3 shows the approximate sample distribution of the rescaled first swap time.

Corollary 1.3. . *Let $\mathbf{T}_{FS,\alpha,n}$ denote the first time the adjacent swap between $\left\lfloor \frac{n(\alpha+1)}{2} \right\rfloor$ and $\left\lfloor \frac{n(\alpha+1)}{2} \right\rfloor + 1$ appears in the random sorting network of size n. The following convergence in law holds:*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{2\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}}{n} \mathbf{T}_{FS,\alpha,n} = \mathbf{T}_{\text{FS}},$$

where

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mathbf{T}_{\text{FS}} > t\right] = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \int_{[0,t]^k} \det[K_{\text{edge}}(u_i, u_j)]_{i,j} \, du_1 \cdots du_k, \text{ with} \tag{1.1}$$

$$K_{\text{edge}}(u_1, u_2) = \frac{\sin(u_1 - u_2)}{\pi(u_1 - u_2)} + \frac{\sin(u_1 + u_2)}{\pi(u_1 + u_2)} \text{ for } u_1, u_2 \geq 0 \quad \left(\frac{\sin 0}{0} = 1 \right).$$



FIGURE 3. Density histogram of 2000 samples of the rescaled first swap time for 500 in a 1000 element random sorting network.

Our proof of Theorem 1.2 builds upon two ideas. The first one (which is also used in most of the rigorous results on sorting networks) is to reduce the study of the random sorting networks to uniformly–random staircase–shaped Young tableaux via the Edelman–Green bijection [EG] (see also [HY]). Our key new observation is that if we *Poissonize* uniformly random standard Young tableaux (of arbitrary shape!), then the result can be described by a determinantal point process with an explicit correlation kernel written as a double contour integral. We prove this by a certain limit transition from the correlation kernels for random Gelfand–Tsetlin patterns of Petrov [P] (see also [DM]). We further show that the Poissonization does not change the local statistics, and therefore, the limit theorem is reduced to the asymptotic analysis of the aforementioned double contour integral, which we perform.

We believe that our results on the correlations and limiting behavior of random standard Young tableaux might be of independent interest, and we present them in the next section.

1.3. **Random Standard Young tableaux.** A partition λ is a sequence of non-negative integers $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq 0$ such that $|\lambda| := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i < \infty$. The *length* of λ, denoted $\ell(\lambda)$, is the number of positive λ_i and the *size* of λ is $|\lambda|$.

We identify a partition with a *Young diagram* (YD), which is the set of lattice points

$$\{(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : i \geq 1,\, 1 \leq j \leq \lambda_i\}.$$

The points of the Young diagram λ are its *cells* and we say the Young diagram has *shape* λ. Given a pair of YDs λ and μ, we write $\lambda \preceq \mu$ if the cells of λ are contained within the cells of μ. If the containment is strict then $\lambda \prec \mu$. If $\lambda \preceq \mu$ then $\mu \setminus \lambda$ denotes the cells of μ that are not in λ. A *standard Young tableaux* (SYT) of shape λ is an insertion of the numbers $1, 2, \ldots, |\lambda|$ into the cells of λ such that they strictly increase along the rows (from left to right) and also along the columns (from bottom to top). The numbers within an SYT are its *entries*. The set of SYT of shape λ is in bijection with the set of increasing sequences of YD

$$\emptyset = \lambda^{(0)} \prec \lambda^{(1)} \prec \lambda^{(2)} \prec \cdots \prec \lambda^{(|\lambda|)} = \lambda \tag{1.2}$$

such that the entry k is inserted in the singleton cell of $\lambda^{(k)} \setminus \lambda^{(k-1)}$ for $1 \leq k \leq |\lambda|$.

A staircase shaped SYT of length $n-1$ (or also $n-1$ rows) is a SYT of shape $(n-1, n-2, \dots, 2, 1)$, which we denote Δ_n; see Figure 4. The Edelman–Green bijection [EG] gives a one-to-one correspondence between staircase shaped Young tableaux and sorting networks; see Section 6.1 for the details. This is the reason for our interest in SYT.

7			
5	10		
2	6	8	
1	3	4	9

FIGURE 4. A staircase shaped SYT with 4 rows. Cells along the diagonal form the edge.

A Poissonized Young tableau (PYT) of shape λ is an insertion of distinct real numbers from the interval $(0, 1)$ into the cells of λ such that they strictly increase along the rows and along the columns. Note that if we replace the entries of a PYT by their relative ranks then we get a SYT. The set of PYT of shape λ is in bijection with the set of increasing sequences of YD indicating the times of jumps:

$$\emptyset = \lambda^{(0)} \overset{t_1}{\prec} \lambda^{(1)} \overset{t_2}{\prec} \lambda^{(2)} \overset{t_3}{\prec} \cdots \overset{t_{|\lambda|}}{\prec} \lambda^{(|\lambda|)} = \lambda \tag{1.3}$$

such that the entry t_k is inserted in the singleton cell of $\lambda^{(k)} \setminus \lambda^{(k-1)}$ for $1 \le k \le |\lambda|$. These increasing sequences of Young diagrams with labels were discussed in [BO] in the connection to *Young bouquet*, see also [N].

We would like to identify a PYT with a collection of non-intersecting paths. For that we first map a Young diagram λ to a countable particle configuration $\{\lambda_i - i + 1/2\}_{i=1,2,\dots} \subset \mathbb{Z} + 1/2$. This procedure can be viewed as projecting the boundary of the Young diagram in *Russian notation* onto horizontal line, see Figure 5. The empty Young diagram $\emptyset$ corresponds to $\{-1/2, -3/2, -5/2, \dots\}$.



FIGURE 5. Young diagram $(4, 4, 4, 2, 1, 1)$ and corresponding particle configuration $(7/2, 5/2, 3/2, -3/2, -7/2, -9/2, -13/2, -15/2, \dots)$.

Give a PYT, for each t consider the countable particle configuration corresponding to the Young diagram filled with numbers $\le t$ in the PYT. The trajectories of particles then form a



FIGURE 6. Particle system associated to a staircase shaped PYT of size 10. Particles move along non-intersecting paths. The jumps (red crosses) of a random PYT of fixed shape is a determinantal process. The local window of a PYT of shape Δ_n consists of the trajectories of a group of L successive particles traced down from $t = 1$ to $t = 1 - (u/n)$.

collection of paths, making jumps to the right at the times indexed by the entries t_k of the tableau (equivalently, labels in (1.3)). Let us draw a cross at a point (x, t), $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, $0 < t < 1$, if a particle jumps from $(x - 1/2)$ to $(x + 1/2)$ at time t; see Figure 6. Although there are infinitely many particles the only ones that move are the $\ell(\lambda)$ that correspond to the positive rows of λ.

Theorem 1.4. *For a Young diagram λ of finite size consider the point process $\mathcal{X}_\lambda$ of jumps of a uniformly random Poissonized Young tableau of shape λ. $\mathcal{X}_\lambda$ is a determinantal point process on $\mathbb{Z}\times[0,1]$ with correlation kernel $K_\lambda(x_1,t_1;x_2,t_2)$ as follows. For $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $t_1, t_2 \in [0,1]$,*

$$K_\lambda(x_1,t_1;x_2;t_2) = \mathbf{1}_{\{t_2>t_1,\, x_1>x_2\}} \frac{(t_1-t_2)^{x_1-x_2-1}}{(x_1-x_2-1)!} +$$
$$\frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^2} \oint\limits_{C_z[0,\lambda_1-x_2)} dz \oint\limits_{C_w[0,n+x_1)} dw\, \frac{\Gamma(-w)}{\Gamma(z+1)} \cdot \frac{G_\lambda(z+x_2)}{G_\lambda(x_1-1-w)} \cdot \frac{(1-t_2)^z(1-t_1)^w}{w+z+x_2-x_1+1},$$
$$\text{where } G_\lambda(u) = \Gamma(u+1)\prod_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{u+i}{u-\lambda_i+i} = \frac{\Gamma(u+1+n)}{\prod_{i=1}^{n}(u-\lambda_i+i)}, \quad n \geq \ell(\lambda).$$

The contours $C_z[0,\lambda_1-x_2)$ and $C_w[0,n+x_1)$ are as shown in Figure 7. Both are counter-clockwise, encloses only the integers in the respective half open intervals $[0,\lambda_1-x_2)$ and $[0,n+x_1)$, and arranged such that $w+z+x_2-x_1+1$ remains uniformly bounded away from 0 along the contours.

Remark 1. When t_1 or t_2 equals 1 then K_λ is to be understood in the limit as t_1 or t_2 tends to 1. The boundary values are not particularly relevant since $\mathcal{X}_\lambda$ almost surely has no points on the boundary. The contours $C_z[0,\lambda_1-x_2)$ and $C_w[0,n-x_2)$ may also be replaced by unbounded contours $C_z[0,\infty)$ and $C_w[0,\infty)$, respectively, because the integrand has no additional poles outside the first pair of contours and decays at an exponential rate of $(1-t_1)^{\Re(w)}(1-t_2)^{\Re(z)}$ as $\Re(w), \Re(z) \to +\infty$.



FIGURE 7. The contours in the statement of Theorem 1.4.

Remark 2. Throughout the paper all contours should intersect the real line at points which have distance at least 1/10 from the integers. This ensures that the integrands of all contour integrals will be a uniform distance away from their poles.

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is through a limit transition in the correlation kernel of [P] (see also [DM]) for the uniformly random Gelfand–Tsetlin patterns; the proof is in Section 3. Such a limit transition can be viewed as a degeneration of the combinatorial structures related to the representation theory of the unitary groups $U(N)$ to those related to the symmetric groups $S(n)$, see [BO] for a discussion.

Let us emphasize that the very same procedure can be used to identify the SYT with a point processes of jumps, however, the resulting process will *not* be determinantal — this is why we need to pass from SYT to PYT.

1.4. **From Poissonized tableaux to local statistics.** We close the introduction with an outline of the path that takes us from Poissonized tableaux to local statistics of sorting networks. By the nature of the Edelman-Greene bijection the swaps of a sorting network of size n near time 0 are determined by the location of the largest entries of some SYT of shape Δ_n. These entries reside within unit order distance of the *edge* of Δ_n, which consist of the cells $(i, n-i)$ for $1 \le i \le n-1$; see Figure 4. As a result, the first step to deriving local statistics of random sorting networks is to derive the statistics of uniformly random PYT of shape Δ_n near the edge.

More precisely, we are interested in the limiting statistics of the entries of a uniformly random PYT of shape Δ_n, denoted $\mathcal{T}_{\Delta_n}$, that lie within the following window along the edge. The window may be parametrized by a center $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$ (corresponding to the center $\frac{(1+\alpha)n}{2}$ of the swaps of a sorting network), length L and entry height u. The window then consist of entries $\mathcal{T}_{\Delta_n}(i, j)$ that satisfy $|i - (1+\alpha)n/2| \le L$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\Delta_n}(i, j) \ge 1 - \frac{u}{n}$. In other words, roughly the largest nu entries of $\mathcal{T}_{\Delta_n}$ with row indices in the interval $[(1+\alpha)n/2 - L, (1+\alpha)n/2 + L]$.

In terms of the process of jumps of $\mathcal{T}_{\Delta_n}$ the local window consists of the points of $\mathcal{X}_{\Delta_n}$ in the region $[\alpha n - L, \alpha n + L] \times [1 - \frac{u}{n}, 1]$. Thus, we consider the following rescaled process of jumps. For each integer $n \ge 1$ let c_n be an integer having the same parity as n and such that

$|c_n - \alpha n| = O(1)$ as $n \to \infty$. Consider the point process $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n}$ on $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ given by

$$\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n} = \left\{ (x,u) : \left(x + c_n, 1 - \frac{u}{\sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\, n} \right) \in \mathcal{X}_{\Delta_n} \right\}. \tag{1.4}$$

Theorem 1.5. *The point process $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n}$ converges weakly as $n \to \infty$ to the point process $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ of Definition 1.1.*

The proof of Theorem 1.5 is in Section 4. It is the main building block for the proof of Theorem 1.2.

In Section 5 we construct the local staircase shaped tableau $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ by using the local jump process $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$. This is a random, infinite staircase shaped tableau viewed from the edge inwards such that the statistics of $\mathcal{T}_{\Delta_n}$ in a local window, with appropriate rescaling, converges weakly to the law of the entries of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ in the corresponding window. The limit theorem is stated as Theorem 5.2. Using a de-Poissonization argument we then conclude in Corollary 5.3 that uniformly random staircase shaped SYT also converge in the same local sense to $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$. Although Poissonization is not important for the local limit it is important for the proof.

In Section 6 we begin the proof of Theorem 1.2. First, we give a direct proof of Corollary 1.3 in Section 6.2. In Section 6.3 we define the local version of the Edelman-Greene algorithm that maps $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ to S_{local}. In Section 6.4 we complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 and establish some statistical properties of S_{local}.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Balint Virág who brought our attention to the problem of identifying local limits of sorting networks. We are grateful to Alexei Borodin for valuable discussions.

V. Gorin's research was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1407562, by Sloan Research Fellowship, and by The Foundation Sciences Mathématiques de Paris. M. Rahman's research was partially supported by an NSERC PDF award.

2. Preliminaries

This section presents the necessary basic facts about Young tableaux, Poissonization and determinantal point processes. Some material from the Introduction is repeated for convenience.

2.1. Gelfand-Tsetlin patterns.

A *semi-standard Young tableaux* of shape $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M)$, where $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_M \geq 0$ are integers, is an insertion of numbers from $\{1, \dots, M\}$ into the cells of the YD λ such that the entries weakly increase along each row and strictly increase along every column. If is important to emphasize that while for the definitions of Young diagrams and standard Young tableaux the value of M would not be important, here the object substantially depends on M. Semi-standard Young tableaux (SSYT) are in bijection with interlacing particle systems, often known as *Gelfand-Tsetlin patterns* (or *schemes*).

A Gelfand-Tsetlin pattern (GTP) with M rows is a triangular array of non-negative integers $[a(i,j)]$ with row i containing i entries $a(i,1), \dots, a(i,i)$. The array satisfies the following order and interlacing constraints.

$$\text{Order \& Interlace}: \quad a(i,j) \geq a(i-1,j) \geq a(i,j+1) \ \text{ for every } i \text{ and } j.$$

Let $a^{(i)} = (a(i,1), \ldots, a(i,i))$ denote the i-th row of the GTP. Each row corresponds to a YD due to the order constraints. The interlacing conditions ensure that $a^{(i-1)} \preceq a^{(i)}$, and in fact, $a^{(i)} \setminus a^{(i-1)}$ is a horizontal strip which means that the cells in any row of $a^{(i)} \setminus a^{(i-1)}$ are to the left of the cells in the previous row. Figure 8 provides an example.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 9 & 5 & 3 & 2 \\ & & 8 & 5 & 2 & \\ & & 6 & 3 & & \\ & & 5 & & & \end{array}$$

FIGURE 8. A Gelfand-Tsetlin pattern with 4 rows.

The set of GTP with a fixed top row $a^{(M)}$ is in bijection with the set of SSYT of shape $\lambda = a^{(M)}$. Indeed, given a GTP $[a(i,j)]$ with top row λ such a tableaux is obtained by inserting the value i into the cells of $a^{(i)} \setminus a^{(i-1)}$ for every $1 \le i \le M$ (set $a^{(0)} = \emptyset$). If $a^{(i)} \setminus a^{(i-1)} = \emptyset$ then i is not inserted. In the reverse direction, given a SSYT of shape λ a GTP with top row λ is obtained by setting $a^{(i)}$ to be the YD consisting of the cells of λ with entries $\le i$, and removing trailing zero rows to ensure that $a^{(i)}$ has i entries.

A GTP may also be represented as an interlacing particle system on $(\mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}) \times \mathbb{Z}$ as follows. Given a GTP $[a(i,j)]$ with M rows, the particle system $[\nu(i,j)]$ associated to it has M rows of particles, with particles on row i being placed on the horizontal line $\{y = i\}$ of the plane, and the position of the j-th particle on row i is

$$\Big(\nu(i,j),\, i\Big) = \Big(a(i,j) - j + \frac{1}{2},\, i\Big) \ \text{ for every } \ 1 \le j \le i.$$

The transformation $a(i,j) \to a(i,j) - j + \frac{1}{2}$ makes the order constraints strict and the interlacing constraints semi-strict:

$$\nu(i,j) \ge \nu(i-1,j) > \nu(i,j+1).$$

The *jumps* of an interlacing particle system ν with M rows is a set of points in $\mathbb{Z} \times \{1, \ldots, M-1\}$ defined inductively from the top row to the bottom row as follows. Given two consecutive rows $[\nu(i,\cdot)]$ and $[\nu(i-1,\cdot)]$ with $2 \le i \le M$, the jumps on row i consist of particles at the positions

$$(k, i-1) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \ \text{ for every integer } k \in [\nu(i-1,j), \nu(i,j)] \ \text{ and every } \ 1 \le j \le i-1.$$

In other words, the jumps of row i are placed on the horizontal line $\{y = i-1\}$ of the plane and fill out integers in the intervals $[\nu(i-1,j), \nu(i,j)]$ for every $1 \le j \le i-1$. Note that ν is determined from its top row and set of jumps.

2.2. **Poissonized Young tableaux.** For a YD λ let $[0,1]^\lambda$ denote the set of functions from the cells of λ into $[0,1]$. Let $\mathrm{PYT}(\lambda)$ denote the set of all functions $T \in [0,1]^\lambda$ that satisfy the following Young tableau constraints.

$$\begin{aligned} &(1)\ T(i,j) \le T(i,j+1) \text{ for every } (i,j) \text{ and } (i,j+1) \in \lambda, \\ &(2)\ T(i,j) \le T(i+1,j) \text{ for every } (i,j) \text{ and } (i+1,j) \in \lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

The *Poissonized tableau* (PYT) of shape λ is an element of $\mathrm{PYT}(\lambda)$. The Poissonized staircase shaped tableau of size $N = \binom{n}{2}$ is an element of $\mathrm{PYT}(\Delta_n)$.

Let $\mathcal{T}_\lambda$ denote a uniformly random element of $\mathrm{PYT}(\lambda)$. Then $\mathcal{T}_\lambda$ is related to a uniformly random SYT of shape λ in the following manner. First, the entries of $\mathcal{T}_\lambda$ are distinct with probability 1. Given that, consider the random SYT $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$ obtained by inserting k into the cell that contains the k-th smallest element of $\mathcal{T}_\lambda$. Then $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$ is a uniformly random SYT of shape λ. In the other direction, $\mathcal{T}_\lambda$ can be generated by first sampling $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$, then independently sampling a uniformly random $Y \in [0,1]^\lambda$, and setting $\mathcal{T}_\lambda(i,j)$ to be the $\mathbf{T}_\lambda(i,j)$-th smallest entry of Y.

Throughout the paper we denote by $\mathcal{T}_\lambda$ a uniformly random element of $\mathrm{PYT}(\lambda)$, and by $\mathbf{T}_\lambda$ a uniformly random SYT of shape λ. We also consider the rescaled tableau $\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_\lambda$, defined by

$$\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_\lambda(i,j) = \frac{\mathbf{T}_\lambda(i,j)}{|\lambda|+1}. \tag{2.2}$$

In order to conclude that $\mathcal{T}_{\Delta_n}$ has the same local statistics as $\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_{\Delta_n}$ in the large n limit we need a comparison bound between their laws. This is explained in the following, whereby Lemma 2.1 below will readily imply that $\mathcal{T}_{\Delta_n}$ and $\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_{\Delta_n}$ have asymptotically the same local statistics.

Consider the ℓ_4-metric on $\mathrm{PYT}(\lambda)$: $||T-\hat{T}||_4^4 = \sum_{(i,j)\in\lambda} |T(i,j)-\hat{T}(i,j)|^4$. Recall that weak convergence of Borel probability measures on a Polish space S can be metrized as follows. Let $\mathrm{BL}(S)$ denote the set of all functions $g : S \to [-1,1]$ such that g is 1-Lipschitz. For probability measures μ, μ',

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mu,\mu') = \sup_{g\in \mathrm{BL}(S)} \left| \int g(x)\,\mu(dx) - \int g(x)\,\mu'(dx) \right|.$$

Lemma 2.1. *In the BL-metric for probability measures on* $\mathrm{PYT}(\lambda)$ *induced by the* ℓ_4*-metric,*

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathcal{T}_\lambda, \mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_\lambda\right) \le 2\,|\lambda|^{-\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Proof. Couple the laws of $\mathcal{T}_\lambda$ and $\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_\lambda$ as previously mentioned. Due to the coupling, for any $g \in \mathrm{BL}(T_\lambda)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \int g(x)\,\mathcal{T}_\lambda(dx) - \int g(x)\,\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_\lambda(dx) \right| &= |\,\mathbb{E}\left[g(\mathcal{T}_\lambda) - g(\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_\lambda)\right]\,| \\ &\le \mathbb{E}\left[||\mathcal{T}_\lambda - \mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_\lambda||_4\right] \quad (\text{as } g \text{ is 1-Lipschitz}) \\ &\le \mathbb{E}\left[||\mathcal{T}_\lambda - \mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_\lambda||_4^4\right]^{1/4}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $P_{(1)} \le P_{(2)} \le \cdots \le P_{(|\lambda|)}$ denote the order statistics of P, that is, the coordinates arranged from smallest to largest. By construction of the coupling,

$$||\mathcal{T}_\lambda - \mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_\lambda||_4^4 = \sum_{k=1}^{|\lambda|} \left| P_{(k)} - \frac{k}{|\lambda|+1} \right|^4.$$

The coordinates of P are independent and identically distributed with the uniform distribution on $[0,1]$. Therefore, $P_{(k)}$ has the law of $\mathrm{Beta}(k, |\lambda|+1-k)$ – a well-known property of the order statistics of uniforms. If Y has the law of $\mathrm{Beta}(p,q)$ then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Y\right] = \frac{p}{p+q}, \quad \mathbb{E}\left[(Y-\mathbb{E}\left[Y\right])^4\right] = \frac{3pq\left(2(p+q)^2 + pq(p+q-6)\right)}{(p+q)^4(p+q+1)(p+q+2)(p+q+3)},$$

see [Wa, Section 4.4]. It follows readily from the above that

$$\max_{1\le k\le|\lambda|}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|P_{(k)}-\frac{k}{|\lambda|+1}\right|^4\right]\le\frac{10}{|\lambda|^2}.$$

Consequently, $\mathbb{E}\left[||\mathcal{T}_\lambda-\mathbf{T}_\lambda^{\mathrm{rsc}}||_4^4\right]\le 10/|\lambda|$ and this establishes the lemma. □

2.3. **Jumps of Poissonized tableaux and local limit.** Any $T\in\mathrm{PYT}(\lambda)$ can be represented as an interlacing particles system with a fixed top row in the following manner. Consider $0\le t\le 1$ and let

$$\mathrm{YD}^{(t)}=\{(i,j)\in\Delta_n : T(i,j)\le t\}.$$

The tableaux constraints (2.1) ensure that $\mathrm{YD}^{(\mathrm{t})}$ is a YD for every t. Recall that a YD can be extended to have an infinite number of rows by appending rows of size 0 following the last positive row. Encode λ as particle configuration on $\mathbb{Z}+\frac{1}{2}$ by placing a particle at position

$$\nu_j=\lambda_j-j+\frac{1}{2}\ \text{ for }\ j\ge 1. \tag{2.3}$$

This is an infinite particle configuration on $\mathbb{Z}+\frac{1}{2}$ such that $\nu_1>\nu_2>\cdots$ and $\nu_j-\nu_{j+1}=1$ for $j>\ell(\lambda)$. Let $\nu^{(t)}$ be the particle configuration associated to $\mathrm{YD}^{(\mathrm{t})}$ via (2.3) and let $\nu=(\nu^{(t)};0\le t\le 1)$ be the particle system on $(\mathbb{Z}+\frac{1}{2})\times[0,1]$ with a particle at position (x,t) if and only if $x\in\nu^{(t)}$.

The particle system $\nu^{(t)}$ viewed in the reverse time, i.e., from $t=1$ to $t=0$, can be interpreted as an ensemble of non-intersecting and non-increasing paths $p(i,u)$, for $1\le i\le\ell(\lambda)$. Let $p(i,u)$ be the $(\mathbb{Z}+\frac{1}{2})$-valued path starting from $p(i,0)=\nu_i^{(0)}$ and decreasing an integer unit at the times $1-T(i,\lambda_i),1-T(i,\lambda_i-1),\ldots,1-T(i,1)$. If some of the entries are equal then $p(i,u)$ decreases by the number of consecutive equal entries. The paths should be left continuous so that the jumps occur immediately after the jump times; $p(i,u)$ decreases by λ_i units with final position $p(i,1)=-i+\frac{1}{2}$. Due to the columns of T being non-decreasing – condition (2) of (2.1)– the paths are *non-intersecting*: $p(i,u)>p(i+1,u)$ for every i and u. Figure 6 shows the collection of paths associated to a staircase shaped PYT.

The *jumps* of $p(i,u)$ consists of points $(x,t)\in\mathbb{Z}\times[0,1]$ such that

(1) $1-t$ is a discontinuity point of $p(i,u)$, that is, t equals some entry of T on row i.
(2) x in an integer in the interval $\big[p(i,(1-t)+),\,p(i,1-t)\big]$, where $p(i,u+)=\lim_{s\downarrow u}p(i,s)$.

The paths can be reconstructed from their jumps and initial positions. The *jumps* of ν, and also of T, is the (possibly) multiset of $\mathbb{Z}\times[0,1]$ defined by

$$X=\{(x,t):(x,t)\ \text{ is a jump of some path }\ p(i,u)\}. \tag{2.4}$$

X may be a multiset because two adjacent paths may jump at the same time by amounts that causes some of their jumps to coincide. The coinciding jumps must be counted with multiplicity. However, if the entries of T are distinct then X is a simple set. The tableau can be reconstructed from its jumps and the initial position of the paths at $\nu_1^{(0)},\ldots,\nu_{\ell(\lambda)}^{(0)}$.

Let $\mathcal{X}_\lambda$ denote the jumps of a uniformly random element $\mathcal{T}_\lambda$ of $\mathrm{PYT}(\lambda)$. $\mathcal{X}_\lambda$ is almost surely simple since $\mathcal{T}_\lambda$ has distinct entries almost surely. Theorem 1.4 states that $\mathcal{X}_\lambda$ is a determinantal point process on $\mathbb{Z}\times[0,1]$.

2.4. **Determinantal point processes.** We describe some basic notions about point processes; for a thorough introduction see [B, DV]. Let S be a locally compact Polish space. A *discrete subset* X of S is a countable multiset of S with no accumulation points. By identifying X with the measure $\sum_{x\in X}\delta_x$ the space of discrete subsets can be endowed with the topology of weak convergence of Borel measures on S. This means that $X_n\to X_\infty$ if for every compact subset $C\subset S$, $\limsup_n \#(C\cap X_n)\le \#(C\cap X_\infty)$, where cardinality is consider with multiplicity. In the case of $S\subset\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}$ convergence is equivalent to the criterion that for every x and j, the j-th smallest point of X_n on $\{x\}\times\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}$ counted with multiplicity converges to the j-th smallest point of X_∞ on that line. A discrete set is simple if every point has multiplicity 1. All random discrete sets that we consider in this paper will be simple almost surely.

Throughout the paper we denote $\#_{\mathbb{Z}}$ to be counting measure on $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathcal{L}(A)$ to be Lebesgue measure on a measurable subset $A\subset\mathbb{R}$. Also, $\mu_1\otimes\mu_2$ denotes the product of measures μ_1 and μ_2, and $\mu^{\otimes k}$ denotes the k-fold product of μ.

A *determinantal point process* $\mathcal{X}$ on S is a Borel probability measure on simple discrete subsets of S for which there is a correlation kernel $K: S\times S\to\mathbb{R}$ and a Radon measure μ on S, called the reference measure, with the following property. For every continuous $f: S^k\to\mathbb{R}$ of compact support,

(2.5)
$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{\substack{(x_1,\dots,x_k)\in\mathcal{X}^k\\ x_1,\dots,x_k \text{ distinct}}} f(x_1,\dots,x_k)\right]=\int_{S^k}\det\left[K(x_i,x_j)\right]_{1\le i,j\le k} f(x_1,\dots,x_k)\,\mu^{\otimes k}(dx_1,\dots,dx_k).$$

Expectations of the form given by the l.h.s. of (2.5) determine the law of $\mathcal{X}$ under mild conditions on K [Le]. This will be the case in this paper as the correlation kernels we consider will be continuous (up to measure zero sets). If S is discrete then it is customary to take the reference measure to be counting measure. In this case $\mathcal{X}$ is determinantal if for every finite $A\subset S$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[A\subset\mathcal{X}\right]=\det\left[K(x,y)\right]_{x,y\in A}.$$

Remark 3. The correlation kernel of a determinantal process is not unique. If $\mathcal{X}$ is a determinantal process with correlation kernel K, then K may be replaced by $\frac{g(x)}{g(y)}K(x,y)$ for any non-vanishing function g without changing determinants on the r.h.s. of (2.5). Thus the new kernel determines the same process. This observation will be used later in deriving weak limits of determinantal processes.

The determinantal processes that we consider will live on spaces of the form $S=\mathbb{Z}\times\{0,\dots,M\}$, or $S=\mathbb{Z}\times[0,1]$, or $S=\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}$ with reference measures being, respectively, counting measure, $\#_{\mathbb{Z}}\otimes\mathcal{L}[0,1]$ and $\#_{\mathbb{Z}}\otimes\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0})$. The following lemma records some well-known facts that will be used in deriving weak limits of determinantal processes. We do not include the proof as it is rather standard; see [B, DV, Le].

Lemma 2.2. *I) Let $\mathcal{X}_M$ be a determinantal process on $\mathbb{Z}\times\{1,\dots,M\}$ with correlation kernel K_M. For $x_1,x_2\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $0\le t_1,t_2\le 1$ let*

$$k_M(x_1,t_1;x_2,t_2)=MK_M(x_1,\lceil Mt_1\rceil;x_2,\lceil Mt_2\rceil).$$

Suppose that $k_M \to k$ uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{Z} \times (0,1)$. Then the point process

$$\mathcal{X}_M^{\text{scaled}} = \{(x, t/M) : (x,t) \in \mathcal{X}_M\}$$

restricted to $\mathbb{Z} \times (0,1)$ converges weakly to a determinantal process $\mathcal{X}$ on $\mathbb{Z} \times (0,1)$ whose reference measure is $\#_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes \mathcal{L}(0,1)$ and correlation kernel is given by k.

II) Let $\mathcal{X}_n$ be a determinantal process on $\mathbb{Z} \times (0,1]$ with reference measure $\#_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes \mathcal{L}(0,1]$ and correlation kernel K_n. For $c_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\beta > 0$ consider the point process on $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{X}_n^{\text{scaled}} = \left\{ \big(x - c_n,\, \beta n(1-t)\big) : (x,t) \in \mathcal{X}_n \right\}.$$

The correlation kernel of $\mathcal{X}_n^{\text{scaled}}$ with reference measure $\#_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ is

$$k_n(x_1, u_1; x_2, u_2) = (\beta n)^{-1} K_n\left(x_1 + c_n, 1 - \frac{u_1}{\beta n};\, x_2 + c_n, 1 - \frac{u_2}{\beta n}\right).$$

If $k_n \to k$ uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ then $\mathcal{X}_n^{\text{scaled}}$ converges weakly to a determinantal process $\mathcal{X}$ on $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with reference measure $\#_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}_{>0})$ and correlation kernel k.

Extend $\mathcal{X}$ to a point process on $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ without additional points. Then $\mathcal{X}_n^{\text{scaled}}$ converges weakly to $\mathcal{X}$ on $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ if the points of $\mathcal{X}_n^{\text{scaled}}$ do not accumulate at the boundary in the sense that for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left[\mathcal{X}_n^{\text{scaled}} \cap (\{x\} \times [0, \epsilon]) \neq \emptyset\right] = 0.$$

3. Determinantal representation of Poissonized tableaux

3.1. **Determinantal representation of discrete interlacing particle systems.** In order to prove Theorem 1.4 we use a determinantal description of discrete interlacing particle systems due to Petrov. This is the main tool behind our limit theorems.

Let $\nu = (\nu(M,1) + \frac{1}{2} > \cdots > \nu(M,M) + \frac{1}{2})$ be a fixed particle configuration on $\mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$. Here we abuse notation from Section 2.1 to have the $\nu(M,j)$s be integers instead of half-integers. Let $\mathbb{P}_\nu$ be the uniform measure on all interlacing particle systems, or equivalently GTP as described in Section 2.1, with fixed top row ν. Let $\mathcal{X}_\nu$ be the process of jumps of an interlacing particle system sampled according to $\mathbb{P}_\nu$, where jumps are as described in Section 2.1.

Petrov [P, Theorem 5.1] proves that $\mathbb{P}_\nu$ is a determinantal process on $(\mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}) \times \{1, \ldots, M\}$ with an explicit correlation kernel. According to Petrov's notation the particles live on $\mathbb{Z}$ but we have translated particle systems by $1/2$ so that the jumps are integral. In particular, in the notation of [P, Theorem 5.1] one has $N = M$, $x^{M,j} = \nu(M,j)$ and the variables x_1, x_2 take integer values. In [P, Section 6.1] it is then explained that the point process of jumps $\mathcal{X}_\nu$ is also determinantal on $\mathbb{Z} \times \{1, \ldots, M-1\}$ and its correlation kernel is given in terms of the correlation kernel of $\mathbb{P}_\nu$ in [P, Theorem 6.1] (up to the translation by $1/2$).

The discussion there is in terms of lozenge tilings of polygonal domains using three types of lozenges as depicted in Figure 9 (see also [P, Figure 9]). Interlacing particle systems with a fixed row top are in bijection with lozenge tilings of specific polygonal domains as discussed in [P, Sections 2.1–2.2]. Petrov shows that the positions of any of the three types of lozenges in such a uniformly random tiling is a determinantal process. In the bijection between interlacing

particle systems and lozenge tilings, the jumps of a particle system are given by the positions of the lozenges of the rightmost type from Figure 9 where as the particles themselves are given by the positions of lozenges of the leftmost type. Jumps occur when a lozenge of the leftmost type is glued to a lozenge of the rightmost type along its bottom diagonal side; see [P, Figure 3] for such a lozenge tiling. Petrov proves in [P, Theorem 6.1] that the correlation kernel of the jumps, $K_{\mathcal{X}_\nu}$, is given by

$$K_{\mathcal{X}_\nu}(x_1, m_1; x_2, m_2) = (-1)^{x_2 - x_1 + m_2 - m_1} K_{\mathbb{P}_\nu}(x_1 - 1, m_1 + 1; x_2, m_2),$$

where $K_{\mathbb{P}_\nu}$ is the kernel presented in [P, Theorem 5.1]. In other words, the kernel for the jumps (= rightmost lozenges) is an appropriate translation of the kernel for the particles (= leftmost lozenges). The kernel $(-1)^{x_2 - x_1 + m_2 - m_1} K_{\mathbb{P}_\nu}(x_1 - 1, m_1 + 1; x_2, m_2)$ defines the same determinantal process as the kernel $K_{\mathbb{P}_\nu}(x_1 - 1, m_1 + 1; x_2, m_2)$ by Remark 3, and we will use the latter.



FIGURE 9. The 3 types of lozenges used in tiling polygonal domains that correspond to interlacing particle systems. Position of a lozenge is given by midpoint of the horizontal side of the black triangular part (red square). The positions have integer coordinates. Particles correspond to positions of the leftmost lozenges but translated by $1/2$ in the x-coordinate (in our notation). Jumps correspond to positions of the rightmost lozenges.

In order to express the kernel for the process of jumps some notation is needed. For integers a and b, let $C[a, b)$ denote a closed counter-clockwise contour on $\mathbb{C}$ that encloses only the integers $a, a+1, \dots, b-1$ if $a > b$ and empty otherwise. For $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and integer $m \geq 1$, let

$$(z)_m = z(z+1)\cdots(z-m+1), \quad (z)_0 = 1.$$

Theorem 3.1 ([P, Theorem 5.1])**.** *The process of jumps, $\mathcal{X}_\nu$, of a uniformly random interlacing particle system with fixed top row $\nu = \left(\nu(M,1) + \frac{1}{2} > \nu(M,2) + \frac{1}{2} > \cdots > \nu(M,M) + \frac{1}{2}\right)$ is a determinantal process on $\mathbb{Z} \times \{1, \dots, M-1\}$ with correlation kernel K given in terms of a double contour integral as follows. For $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $1 \leq m_1, m_2 \leq M-1$,*

$$K(x_1, m_1; x_2, m_2) = -\mathbf{1}_{\{m_2 \leq m_1,\, x_2 < x_1\}} \frac{(x_1 - x_2)_{m_1 - m_2}}{(m_1 - m_2)!} + \tag{3.1}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^2} \oint_{C_z[x_2, \nu(M,1)+1)} dz \oint_{C_w[x_1 - M, \nu(M,1)+1)} dw \left[\frac{(z - x_2 + 1)_{M - m_2 - 1}}{(w - x_1 + 1)_{M - m_1}} \cdot \frac{(M - m_1 - 1)!}{(M - m_2 - 1)!} \times \right.$$

$$\left. \times \frac{1}{w - z} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{M} \frac{w - \nu(M,j)}{z - \nu(M,j)} \right].$$

The contour $C_w[-M, \nu(M,1)+1)$ contains $C_z[x_2, \nu(M,1)+1)$ without intersecting it.

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.4.** Let λ be a Young diagram with at most n rows of positive length, that is, $\ell(\lambda) \leq n$. For $M \geq n$, consider semi-standard Young tableaux of shape

$$\lambda_M = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{M-n \text{ zeroes}}).$$

The affect of adding $M - n$ zero rows is to allow the entries in the non-zero rows of λ to be between 1 to M. The law of the uniformly random PYT on shape λ is the weak limit of the uniformly random semi-standard Young tableaux of shape λ_M as $M \to \infty$ after the entries are rescaled onto the interval $[0, 1]$. Indeed, the law of the PYT of shape λ can be approximated by the uniform distribution on points $[T(i, j)] \in [0, 1]^\lambda$ that satisfy the tableau constraints (2.1) and with each $T(i, j) = k/M$ for some $1 \leq k \leq M$, and the column constraints being strict.

The top row of particle systems associated to semi-standard Young tableaux of shape λ_M under the bijection described in Section 2.1 is

$$\nu_\lambda^{(M)} = \left((\lambda_1 - 1) + \frac{1}{2}, \ldots, (\lambda_n - n) + \frac{1}{2}, -(n+1) + \frac{1}{2}, -(n+2) + \frac{1}{2}, \ldots, -M + \frac{1}{2} \right). \tag{3.2}$$

The approximation scheme discussed above and the bijection between semi-standard Young tableaux and interlacing particle systems discussed in Section 2.2 imply that the process of jumps, $\mathcal{X}_\lambda$, of uniformly random PYT of shape λ is the weak limit of the process of jumps, $\mathcal{X}_{\lambda_M}$, of a uniformly random interlacing particle system with top row $\nu^{(M)}$ after the jumps of latter process is rescaled onto $\mathbb{Z} \times \{1/(M-1), \ldots, 1\}$.

Thus, our task is to derive a determinantal description of the rescaled jumps of $\mathcal{X}_{\lambda_M}$ in the large M limit. Since the process $\mathcal{X}_\lambda$ almost surely contains no jumps on the boundary $\mathbb{Z} \times \{0, 1\}$ it suffices to derive the determinantal description when $\mathcal{X}_\lambda$ is restricted to $\mathbb{Z} \times (0, 1)$.

As a remark, the kernel K_λ from Theorem 1.4 actually extends to the boundary in a continuous manner. This is clear for the boundary $\mathbb{Z} \times \{0\}$. Along the boundary $\mathbb{Z} \times \{1\}$ the limiting values of K_λ are obtained via the corresponding residues on the integrand at $z = 0$ (when $t_2 \to 1$) or at $w = 0$ (when $t_1 \to 1$). As such, the determinantal description of $\mathcal{X}_\lambda$ extends to the boundary.

In the following we derive the weak limit of the rescaled jumps of $\mathscr{X}_{\lambda_M}$ restricted to $\mathbb{Z} \times (0, 1)$. Let K_M denote the kernel from Theorem 3.1 for the process $\mathscr{X}_{\lambda_M}$. As explained in Remark 3, the kernel $(M-1)^{x_2 - x_1} K_M(x_1, m_1; x_2, m_2)$ determines the same determinantal process. By Lemma 2.2 it suffices to show that $(M-1)^{x_2 - x_1 + 1} K_M(x_1, \lceil (M-1)t_1 \rceil; x_2, \lceil (M-1)t_2 \rceil)$ converges uniformly to K_λ over compacts subsets of $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $t_1, t_2 \in (0, 1)$.

We begin by deforming the contours in the double contour integral in (3.1) that defines K_M. This will simplify the representation of K_M for taking the large M limit. Deform the w-contour $C_w[x_1 - M, \nu_{\lambda_M}(M, 1) + 1)$ by pushing it leftward past the z-contour $C_z[x_2, \nu_{\lambda_M}(M, 1) + 1)$ so that it encloses the integers $\min\{x_1, x_2\} - 1, \ldots, x_1 - M$. The deformation results in picking up residues at $w = z$ and also at the integers $w = x_1 - 1, \ldots, x_2$ if $x_2 < x_1$.

Let $J_M(w, x_1, m_1; z, x_2, m_2)$ denote the integrand of the double contour integral in (3.1) but without the factor $1/(w - z)$. Note that $\nu_{\lambda_M}(M, 1) + 1 = \lambda_1$. Calculating the residues at $w = z$ and leaving the remaining residues as a contour integral provides the following representation

of K_M after the contour deformation.

$$K_M(x_1,m_1;x_2,m_2) = -\mathbf{1}_{\{m_2\le m_1,\, x_2<x_1\}}\frac{(x_1-x_2)_{m_1-m_2}}{(m_1-m_2)!} + \tag{Ia}$$

$$+\frac{1}{2\pi\mathbf{i}}\oint\limits_{C_z[x_2,\lambda_1)} dz\,\frac{(z-x_2+1)_{M-m_2-1}}{(z-x_1+1)_{M-m_1}}\cdot\frac{(M-m_1-1)!}{(M-m_2-1)!} + \tag{Ib}$$

$$+\frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^2}\oint\limits_{C_z[x_2,\lambda_1)} dz \oint\limits_{C_w[x_1-M,\min\{x_1,x_2\})\cup C_w[x_2,x_1)} dw\,\frac{J_M(w,x_1,m_1;z,x_2,m_2)}{w-z} \tag{II}.$$

The following lemma simplifies $(Ia)+(Ib)$.

Lemma 3.2. *For $0\le m_1,m_2\le M-1$,*

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint\limits_{C_z[x_2,\lambda_1)} dz\,\frac{(z-x_2+1)_{M-m_2-1}}{(z-x_1+1)_{M-m_1}}\cdot\frac{(M-m_1-1)!}{(M-m_2-1)!} - \mathbf{1}_{\{m_2\le m_1,\, x_2<x_1\}}\frac{(x_1-x_2)_{m_1-m_2}}{(m_1-m_2)!}$$
$$= \mathbf{1}_{\{m_2>m_1,\, x_1>x_2\}}\frac{(m_1-m_2+1)_{x_1-x_2-1}}{(x_1-x_2-1)!}.$$

Proof. The integral (Ib) is evaluated in [P, Lemma 6.2] by summing over residues at $z = x_2,\dots,x_1-1$ and evaluating the resulting sum in closed form via a hypergeometric identity. We have

$$(Ib) = \mathbf{1}_{\{x_1>x_2\}}\frac{(m_1-m_2+1)_{x_1-x_2-1}}{(x_1-x_2-1)!}.$$

Therefore,

$$(Ia)+(Ib) = \mathbf{1}_{\{x_1>x_2\}}\left[\frac{(m_1-m_2+1)_{x_1-x_2-1}}{(x_1-x_2-1)!} - \mathbf{1}_{\{m_2\le m_1\}}\frac{(x_1-x_2)_{m_1-m_2}}{(m_1-m_2)!}\right].$$

If $m_2\le m_1$ then the above is 0 because both terms in the difference are equal to $\frac{(m_1-m_2+x_1-x_2-1)!}{(m_1-m_2)!(x_1-x_2-1)!}$. Hence, $(Ia)+(Ib)$ in non zero only if $x_1>x_2$ and $m_2>m_1$ and equals what is given in the statement of the lemma. □

Now consider the expression (II) from (3.3). Observe that the zeroes of $(w-x_1+1)_{M-m_1}$ are at consecutive integers $x_1-1, x_1-2,\dots,x_1-(M-m_1)$. On the other hand the polynomial $\prod_j(w-\nu_{\lambda_M}(M,j))$ also has zeroes at $\nu_{\lambda_M}(M,n+i) = -(n+i)$ for $1\le i\le M-n$. Therefore, the only poles of J_M in the w variable are at the integers $x_1-1,\dots,-n$ so long as $x_1+m_1\ge 0$. For fixed x_1 and $m_1\ge\sqrt{M}$, say, the condition $x_1+m_1\ge 0$ is satisfied for all large M. Thus, the contour integral over $C_w[x_1-M,\min\{x_1,x_2\})$ may be shortened to $C_w[-n,\min\{x_1,x_2\})$ for all large M if x_1 remains fixed and $m_1\ge\sqrt{M}$.

Having done so, (II) becomes the following integral after changing variables $z\mapsto z+x_2$ and $w\mapsto -w+x_1-1$:

$$(II) = \frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^2}\oint\limits_{C_z[0,\lambda_1-x_2)} dz \oint\limits_{C_w[0,n+x_1)} dw\,\frac{(z+1)_{M-m_2-1}\,(M-m_1-1)!\prod_{j=1}^{M}\frac{-w+x_1-1+\nu_{\lambda_M}(M,j)}{z+x_2-\nu_{\lambda_M}(M,j)}}{(-w)_{M-m_1}\,(M-m_2-1)!\,(w+z+x_2-x_1+1)}. \tag{3.4}$$

By a slight abuse of notation let J_M henceforth denote the integrand of (3.4) without the factor $1/(w+z+x_2-x_1+1)$. The following lemma provides the asymptotic form of J_M.

Lemma 3.3. *Fix integers x_1 and x_2. Suppose $0<t_1,t_2<1$ and w and z remain bounded and have distance at least $1/10$ from the integers. Then for $m_1=\lceil t_1(M-1)\rceil$ and $m_2=\lceil t_2(M-1)\rceil$,*

$$(M-1)^{x_1-x_2-1}J_M(w,x_1,m_1;z,x_2,m_2)=(1-t_1)^w(1-t_2)^z\,\frac{\Gamma(-w)\,G_\lambda(z+x_2)}{\Gamma(z+1)\,G_\lambda(x_1-1-w)}\,(1+O(M-1)).$$

The big O term is uniform over z,w so long as the stated assumptions hold and over t_1,t_2 lying in compact subsets of $(0,1)$. The function G_λ is as stated in Theorem 1.4.

Proof. We will use the following identity:

$$(y)_m=\frac{\Gamma(y+m)}{\Gamma(y)},\ \ y\notin\{0,-1,-2,\ldots\}. \tag{3.5}$$

We will also use Stirling's approximation of the Gamma function in the following form:

$$\frac{\Gamma(y+m)}{(m-1)!}=m^y\,(1+O(m^{-1})),\ \ m\geq 1. \tag{3.6}$$

The big O term is uniform in m so long as y is bounded and bounded away from negative integers. Using these two properties, if $m_1=\lceil t_1(M-1)\rceil$ and $m_2=\lceil t_2(M-1)\rceil$ then

$$\frac{(z+1)_{M-m_2-1}}{(-w)_{M-m_1}}\cdot\frac{(M-m_1-1)!}{(M-m_2-1)!}=(1-t_1)^w(1-t_2)^z\,\frac{\Gamma(-w)}{\Gamma(z+1)}\,(M-1)^{z+w}\,(1+O(M^{-1})) \tag{3.7}$$

Now consider the term

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{j=1}^{M}\big(w-\nu_{\lambda_M}(M,j)\big)&=\prod_{j=1}^{n}(w-\lambda_j+j)\cdot(w+n+1)_{M-n}\\&=\prod_{j=1}^{n}(w-\lambda_j+j)\cdot\frac{\Gamma(w+M+1)}{\Gamma(w+n+1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Applying (3.6) to $\Gamma(w+M+1)$ and $\Gamma(z+M+1)$ gives

$$\prod_j\frac{w-\nu_{\lambda_M}(M,j)}{z-\nu_{\lambda_M}(M,j)}=\frac{\Gamma(z+n+1)}{\Gamma(w+n+1)}\cdot\prod_{j=1}^{n}\frac{w-\lambda_j+j}{z-\lambda_j+j}\cdot M^{w-z}\,(1+O(M^{-1})).$$

Substituting in $z+x_2$ and $-w+x_1-1$ then gives

$$\prod_j\frac{-w+x_1-1-\nu_{\lambda_M}(M,j)}{z+x_2-\nu_{\lambda_M}(M,j)}=\frac{G_\lambda(z+x_2)}{G_\lambda(x_1-1-w)}\,(M-1)^{-(w+z)+x_1-x_2-1}(1+O(M^{-1})). \tag{3.8}$$

Combining (3.7) with (3.8) provides the desired conclusion of the lemma. □

We now proceed with the proof that $(M-1)^{x_2-x_1+1}K_M$ converges to K_λ. Suppose x_i are fixed and $m_i=\lceil t_i(M-1)\rceil$ for $i=1,2$ and $t_i\in[\delta,1-\delta]$ for some $\delta>0$. Recall that K_M is given in (3.3). For all sufficiently large values of M, using Lemma 3.2 and then the identity

(3.5) followed by the estimate (3.6) shows that $(Ia)+(Ib)$ of (3.3) equals

$$(Ia)+(Ib) = \mathbf{1}_{\{m_2>m_1,x_1>x_2\}}\frac{(m_1-m_2+1)_{x_1-x_2-1}}{(x_1-x_2-1)!} = \mathbf{1}_{\{t_2>t_1,x_1<x_2\}}\frac{(t_1-t_2)^{x_1-x_2-1}}{(x_1-x_2-1)!}\cdot(M-1)^{x_1-x_2-1}(1+O(M^{-1})). \tag{3.9}$$

Now we consider (II) in the form given in (3.4) following the change of variables. Lemma 3.3 gives that as $M\to\infty$,

$$(M-1)^{x_2-x_1+1}\,J_M(w,x_1,t_1;z,x_2,t_2)\to(1-t_1)^w(1-t_2)^z\frac{\Gamma(-w)\,G_\lambda(z+x_2)}{\Gamma(z+1)\,G_\lambda(x_1-1-w)}. \tag{3.10}$$

The convergence is uniform over compact subsets of w and z so long as w and z are uniformly bounded away from the integers. For all large values of M the contours of integration of (II) become free of M, namely, $z\in C_z[0,\lambda_1-x_2)$ and $w\in C_w[0,n+x_1)$. The contours may certainly be arranged such that they remain bounded away from the integers and $|w+z+x_2-x_1+1|\geq 1/10$ throughout, say. This implies that as $M\to\infty$, $(M-1)^{x_2-x_1+1}\cdot(II)$ converges to

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^2}\oint_{C_z[0,\lambda_1-x_2)}dz\oint_{C_w[0,n+x_1)}dw\,(1-t_1)^w(1-t_2)^z\frac{\Gamma(-w)\,G_\lambda(z+x_2)}{\Gamma(z+1)\,G_\lambda(x_1-1-w)}\frac{1}{(w+z+x_2-x_1+1)}$$

We have thus concluded that $(M-1)^{x_2-x_1+1}K_M$ converges to the kernel K_λ given in Theorem 1.4. Moreover, the estimates show that the converge is uniform over compact subsets of $\mathbb{Z}\times(0,1)$. Indeed, so long at $t_1,t_2\in[\delta,1-\delta]$ and $|x_1|,|x_2|\leq B$ then the error term in the convergence is of order $O_{B,\delta}(M^{-1})$ by Lemma 3.3 because the double contours eventually become free of M and the integrand converges uniformly over the contours. Since $(M-1)^{x_2-x_1+1}K_M$ is an equivalent kernel to MK_M, applying part (I) of Lemma 2.2 we conclude that the rescaled process of jumps, $\mathcal{X}^{\text{scaled}}_{\lambda_M}$, converges weakly on $\mathbb{Z}\times(0,1)$ to a determinantal process with kernel as given in Theorem 1.4. This completes the proof.

4. Local limit of jumps of Poissonized staircase shaped tableaux

4.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.5.** In this section we prove Theorem 1.5, however, the representation of the correlation kernel of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ will not be the one provided in Definition 1.1. Instead we will obtain that $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n}$ has a limit, which is a determinantal process with kernel given in terms of a double contour integral. Later in Section 4.2 we will derive the representation of the kernel that is in Definition 1.1. So we begin with the following auxiliary limit theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *The point process $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n}$ from (1.4) converges weakly to a limiting determinantal point process $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ on $\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. The correlation kernel of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ with respect to reference measure*

$\#_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ is given as follows. For $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$K_{\text{edge}}(x_1, u_1; x_2, u_2) = \mathbf{1}_{\{u_2 < u_1, x_2 < x_1\}} \frac{(u_2 - u_1)^{x_1 - x_2 - 1}}{(x_1 - x_2 - 1)!} + \frac{1}{(2\pi \mathbf{i})^2} \oint_{C_z[0,\infty)} dz \oint_{C_w[0,\infty)} dw \, \frac{\pi}{2} \cdot \frac{G(w; x_1, u_1)\, G(z; x_2, u_2)}{w + z + x_2 - x_1 + 1}, \quad \textit{where}$$

$$G(z; x, u) = \frac{u^z}{\Gamma(z+1) \sin(\frac{\pi}{2}(z + x_2))}. \tag{4.1}$$

The contours $C_z[0,\infty)$ and $C_w[0,\infty)$ are unbounded, contains the non-negative integers but remains uniformly bounded away from them and arranged such that $w + z + x_2 - x_1 + 1$ remains uniformly bounded away from 0. They may also be arranged such that their imaginary parts remain bounded and C_z contains C_w.

The value of K_{edge} when u_1 or u_2 equals 0 is to be understood in the sense of the limit as u_1 or u_2 tends to 0 (the limits exist).

Proof. The proof proceeds in two steps, each verifying the conditions of part (II) of Lemma 2.2. First, we will show that the correlation kernel of $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n}$ converges to K_{edge} uniformly on compact subsets of $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Then we will argue that points of $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n}$ do not accumulate on the boundary $\mathbb{Z} \times \{0\}$ as $n \to \infty$.

Let $\beta = \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2}$. Part (II) of Lemma 2.2 and Theorem 1.4 imply that the correlation kernel of $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n}$ with reference measure $\#_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ is

$$K_n(x_1, u_1; x_2, u_2) = (\beta n)^{-1} K_{\Delta_n}\left(x_1 + c_n, 1 - \frac{u_1}{\beta n}; x_1 + c_n, 1 - \frac{u_1}{\beta n}\right).$$

The kernel $(\beta n)^{x_1 - x_2} K_n$ determines the same point process by Remark 3. Using part (II) of Lemma 2.2 it suffices to show that $(\beta n)^{x_1 - x_2} K_n$ converges uniformly over compact subsets of $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ to K_{edge} as $n \to \infty$ to deduce convergence of $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n}$ to $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ on $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. We do this in the following.

Let G_n denote the function $2^{n-1} G_{\Delta_n}$, where G_{Δ_n} is an in Theorem 1.4. Then

$$G_n(z) = \frac{2^{n-1}\Gamma(z+n+1)}{\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}(z - n + 2j)} = \frac{\Gamma(z+n+1)}{(\frac{z-n}{2} + 1)_{n-1}} = \frac{\Gamma(z+n+1)\,\Gamma\left(\frac{z-n+2}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{z+n}{2}\right)}. \tag{4.2}$$

Substitute in $x_i + c_n$ for the variables x_i and $1 - (\beta n)^{-1} u_i$ for the variables t_i in K_{Δ_n}. Then,

(4.3)

$$K_n(x_1, u_1; x_2, u_2) = \mathbf{1}_{\{u_2 < u_1, x_2 < x_1\}} \frac{(u_2 - u_1)^{x_1 - x_2 - 1}}{(x_1 - x_2 - 1)!} (\beta n)^{x_2 - x_1} + + \frac{1}{(2\pi \mathbf{i})^2} \oint_{C_z[0, n-1-c_n-x_2)} dz \oint_{C_w[0, n-1+c_n+x_1)} dw \, \frac{\Gamma(-w)\, G_n(z + x_2 + c_n)\, u_1^w\, u_2^z\, (\beta n)^{-w-z-1}}{\Gamma(z+1)\, G_n(x_1 - 1 + c_n - w)(w + z + x_2 - x_1 + 1)}.$$

Using the formula for G_n from (4.2) and applying the identity

$$\Gamma(1-y)\Gamma(y)=\frac{\pi}{\sin(\pi y)},\ y\notin\{0,-1,-2,\ldots\},\ \text{to}\ \ y=\frac{n-c_n-z}{2}\ \ \text{gives} \tag{4.4}$$

$$G_n(z+c_n)=\frac{\Gamma(z+n+c_n+1)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+c_n+z}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{n-c_n-z}{2}\right)}\cdot\frac{\pi}{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(n-c_n-z)\right)}. \tag{4.5}$$

The estimate for $\Gamma(z)$ from (3.6) along with the observation that $n\pm c_n=(1\pm\alpha)n+O(1)\to+\infty$ implies the following asymptotic as $n\to\infty$. The symbol $\sim$ denotes a multiplicative term $1+O(n^{-1})$ where the big O error is uniform over z in compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{Z}$.

$$\Gamma\left(\frac{n\pm(c_n+z)}{2}\right)\sim\Gamma\left(\frac{n\pm c_n}{2}\right)\cdot\left(\frac{n\pm c_n}{2}\right)^{\pm\frac{z}{2}}, \tag{4.6}$$

$$\Gamma(n+c_n+z+1)\sim\Gamma(n+c_n)\cdot(n+c_n)^{z+1}. \tag{4.7}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Gamma(n+c_n+z+1)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+c_n+z}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{n-c_n-z}{2}\right)}\cdot\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+c_n+w}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{n-c_n-w}{2}\right)}{\Gamma(n+c_n+w+1)}&\sim\left(\frac{n+c_n}{n-c_n}\right)^{\frac{w-z}{2}}(1+\alpha)^{z-w}\,n^{z-w}\\&\sim\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\right)^{\frac{z-w}{2}}(1+\alpha)^{z-w}\,n^{z-w}\\&=(\beta n)^{z-w}.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting in $z+x_2$ for z and $-w+x_1-1$ for w in this estimate gives

$$\frac{G_n(z+x_2+c_n)}{G_n(-w+x_1-1+c_n)}\sim\frac{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(-w+x_1-1-n-c_n)\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(z+x_2-n-c_n)\right)}(\beta n)^{w+z+x_2-x_1+1}. \tag{4.8}$$

The error in the above estimate vanishes as $n\to\infty$ so long as w,z and the x_i are in compact subsets of their respective domains. We also have that

$$\frac{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(w-n-c_n)\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(z-n-c_n)\right)}=\frac{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}w\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}z\right)}\quad\text{if}\ \ n-c_n\ \ \text{is even.}$$

Since $n-c_n$ is assumed to be even we conclude from (4.8) that so long w and z are bounded and remain uniformly bounded away from the integers then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}(\beta n)^{x_1-x_2+1}\frac{G_n(z+x_2+c_n)(\beta n)^{-w-z-1}}{G_n(x_1+c_n-1-w)}=\frac{-\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(w-x_1+1)\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(z+x_2)\right)}. \tag{4.9}$$

The above displays the pointwise limit of the part of the integrand from (4.3) that depends on n. In order to interchange the pointwise limit with the contour integral we must show that the integrand is bounded uniformly over n by a function that is integrable over the contours $z\in C_z[0,n-1-c_n-x_2)$ and $w\in C_w[0,n-1+c_n+x_1)$, also uniformly over n. Then we may apply the dominated convergence theorem.

Towards this end suppose z is such that (1) $|\Re(z)|\le 2n$, (2) $|\Im(z)|$ is uniformly bounded over n, say by 100, and (3) z remains bounded away from $\mathbb{Z}$ by distance at least $1/10$. In this case Stirling approximation to the Gamma function implies that modulus of the ratio of the l.h.s. of (4.6) to its r.h.s. is bounded above and below by exponential factors of uniform rate in $|\Re(z)|$.

The same holds for the ratio of the l.h.s. of (4.7) to its r.h.s. That is, for some constant C,

$$e^{-C\,(|\Re(z)|+1)} \le \left| \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n\pm(c_n+z)}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n\pm c_n}{2}\right)\cdot\left(\frac{n\pm c_n}{2}\right)^{\pm\frac{z}{2}}} \right| \le e^{C\,(|\Re(z)|+1)},$$

$$e^{-C\,(|\Re(z)|+1)} \le \left| \frac{\Gamma\left(n+c_n+z+1\right)}{\Gamma\left(n+c_n\right)\cdot(n+c_n)^{z+1}} \right| \le e^{C\,(|\Re(z)|+1)}.$$

Throughout the following C denotes a constant that is free of n but its value may change from line to line. We combine the estimates above with the equation for $G_n(z+c_n)$ from (4.5) and observe that there is a C such that $1/C \le |\sin(n-c_n-z)| \le C$ due to the assumptions on z. This in turn implies that there is a C such that

$$e^{-C\,(|\Re(z)|+1)} \le \left| \frac{G_n(z+c_n)}{(\beta n)^z} \right| \le e^{C\,(|\Re(z)|+1)}.$$

The contours $C_z[0, n-1-c_n-x_2)$ and $C_w[0, n-1+c_n+x_1)$ can certainly be arranged such that for fixed x_1 and x_2 the variables $z+x_2$ and $-w+x_1-1$ satisfy the aforementioned assumptions (1)–(3) uniformly over n. Thus, we get the following uniform estimate over n with $z \in C_z[0, n-1-c_n-x_2)$ and $w \in C_w[0, n-1+c_n+x_1)$:

$$\left| \frac{G_n(z+x_2+c_n)}{G_n(-w+x_1-1+c_n)} \right| \le (\beta n)^{\Re(z+w)+x_2-x_1+1}\, e^{C\,(|\Re(z)|+|\Re(w)|+1)}.$$

The contours may also be arranged such that $|w+z+x_2-x_1+1| \ge 1/10$, say. Then the modulus of the integrand of the double contour integral from (4.3) satisfies

$$(\beta n)^{x_1-x_2} \left| \frac{\Gamma(-w)\, G_n(z+x_2+c_n)\, u_1^w\, u_2^z\, (\beta n)^{-w-z-1}}{\Gamma(z+1)\, G_n(x_1-1+c_n-w)\,(w+z+x_2-x_1+1)} \right| \le \left| \frac{\Gamma(-w)}{\Gamma(z+1)} \right| |u_1^w|\, |u_2^z|\, e^{C\,(|\Re(z)|+|\Re(w)|+1)}. \tag{4.10}$$

Stirling's approximation implies that if $\Re(z) \ge 1/10$ and $|\Im(z)|$ remains bounded then

$$\frac{|u^z|}{|\Gamma(z+1)|} = e^{-\Re(z)\log\Re(z)+\Re(z)(\log u+O(1))}. \tag{4.11}$$

Applying (4.4) with $y=-w$ also gives $\Gamma(-w) = -\pi[\Gamma(w+1)\sin(\pi w)]^{-1}$. We have $|\sin(\pi w)|^{-1} \le C$ so long as w remains uniformly bounded away from the integers. Combining this with (4.11) shows that the r.h.s. of (4.10) is integrable over unbounded double contours $C_z[0,\infty) \ni z$ and $C_w[0,\infty) \ni w$ as long as the contours are arranged such that z, w remain uniformly bounded away from the integers, have uniformly bounded imaginary parts, and $z+w+x_2-x_1+1$ remains uniformly bounded away from 0. Thus, the limit (4.9), upper bound (4.10) and the dominated convergence theorem implies that as $n \to \infty$

$$(\beta n)^{x_1-x_2}\, K_n(x_1,u_1;x_2,u_2) \to \mathbf{1}_{\{u_2<u_1, x_2<x_1\}}\, \frac{(u_2-u_1)^{x_1-x_2-1}}{(x_1-x_2-1)!} + \frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^2} \oint_{C_z[0,\infty)} dz \oint_{C_w[0,\infty)} dw\, u_1^w u_2^z \cdot \frac{-\Gamma(-w)\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(w-x_1+1)\right)}{\Gamma(z+1)\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(z+x_2)\right)} \cdot \frac{1}{w+z+x_2-x_1+1}.$$

Furthermore, our estimates show that the convergence is uniform over x_i in compact subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$ and u_i in compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$. (In fact, when some $u_i \to 0$ the integral contributes only through residues at the origin. Lemma 4.2 computes the limit as $u_i \to 0$.) Comparing the limit integrand with the one presented in (4.1) we observe that the proof of the kernel convergence will be complete once it is shown that

$$-\Gamma(-w)\sin\Big(\frac{\pi}{2}(w-x_1+1)\Big) = \frac{(\pi/2)}{\Gamma(w+1)\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(w+x_1)\right)}.$$

From (4.4), $-\Gamma(-w) = \pi[\Gamma(w+1)\sin(\pi w)]^{-1}$. Also, $\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}(w-x+1)) = \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}(w-x))$. Finally, double angle trigonometric formulae imply $\sin(\pi w) = 2\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}(w+x))\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}(w-x))$. Substituting these equations into the l.h.s. of the above verifies the equality with the r.h.s.

To complete the proof of convergence of $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n}$ to $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ on $\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ it is enough to show, using Lemma 2.2, that for every $x\in\mathbb{Z}$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\left[\#\,\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n}\cap(\{x\}\times[0,\epsilon])\right] = 0. \tag{4.12}$$

In other words, points do not accumulate at the boundary in the limit. From relation (2.5) for determinantal processes and (4.3) we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\#\,\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n}\cap(\{x\}\times[0,\epsilon])\right] = \int_0^\epsilon K_n(x,t;x,t)\,dt$$

$$= \frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^2}\oint_{C_z[0,n-1-c_n-x_2)}dz\oint_{C_w[0,n-1+c_n+x_1)}dw\,\frac{\Gamma(-w)\,G_n(z+x_2+c_n)\left(\int_0^\epsilon t^{w+z}\,dt\right)(\beta n)^{-w-z-1}}{\Gamma(z+1)\,G_n(x_1-1+c_n-w)(w+z+1)}$$

$$= \frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^2}\oint_{C_z[0,n-1-c_n-x_2)}dz\oint_{C_w[0,n-1+c_n+x_1)}dw\,\frac{\Gamma(-w)\,G_n(z+x_2+c_n)\,\epsilon^{w+z+1}\,(\beta n)^{-w-z-1}}{\Gamma(z+1)\,G_n(x_1-1+c_n-w)(w+z+1)^2}.$$

The quantity above is of the from $\epsilon I_{\epsilon,n}$. Arguing exactly as in the derivation of the limit kernel, $I_{\epsilon,n}\to I_\epsilon$ where I_ϵ is given by the double contour integral in the definition of $K_{\text{edge}}(x,\epsilon;x,\epsilon)$ from (4.1) but with an additional factor of $w+z+1$ in the denominator of the integrand. Indeed, $\epsilon I_\epsilon = \int_0^\epsilon K_{\text{edge}}(x,t;x,t)\,dt$, which is the expected number of point on $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ on $\{x\}\times[0,\epsilon]$. The quantity I_ϵ remains uniformly bounded near $\epsilon=0$ since as $\epsilon\to 0$ the contribution to the integral that defines I_ϵ comes from the residues at $w,z=0$ and these residues do not depend on ϵ. (See Lemma 4.2 where $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}K_{\text{edge}}(x,\epsilon;x,\epsilon)$ is derived analogously.) Consequently, $\epsilon I_\epsilon\to 0$ as $\epsilon\to 0$ and thus the condition of (4.12) holds. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

4.2. **Integral representation of the edge kernel.** In this section we derive the integral form of the kernel K_{edge} as given in Definition 1.1; the result is stated as Proposition 4.3. We begin with an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $C_w[0,\infty)$ and $C_z[0,\infty)$ be contours as in the statement of Theorem 4.1 and let $G(z;x,u)$ be as in (4.1). For $t>0$ let*

$$I(t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^2}\oint_{C_z[0,\infty)}dz\oint_{C_w[0,\infty)}dw\,\frac{\pi}{2}\cdot\frac{G(w;x_1,tu_1)\,G(z;x_2,tu_2))}{w+z+x_2-x_1+1}.$$

Then,

$$\lim_{t\to 0} I(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{\pi}\,\frac{\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}x_2)}{x_2-x_1+1} & \text{if } x_2 \neq x_1-1 \\ -\mathbf{1}_{\{x_1 \text{ even}\}} & \text{if } x_2 = x_1-1. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, I is continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and can be differentiated by interchanging differentiation with the contour integration.

Proof. To see that I is continuously differentiable we may use the dominated convergence theorem to interchange differentiation with the integral so long as the the expression for $I'(t)$ given above is absolute integrable for t over compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Observe that contours of integration contain no singularities of the integrand, and in fact, are arranged to be a positive distance from all zeroes of $\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}(z+x_2))$ and $\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}(w+x_1))$ in the denominator. The estimate of $|u^z|/|\Gamma(z+1)|$ from (4.11) shows that the integrand is absolutely integrable over the double contours as long as t lies in a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Consequently, I is continuously differentiable and the derivative may be interchanged with integration.

Let us now consider the limiting value of $I(t)$ as $t \to 0$. Decomposing C_w as $C_w[0,1) \cup C_w[1,\infty)$ and similarly for C_z gives

$$\oint_{C_z}\oint_{C_w} = \oint_{C_z[0]}\oint_{C_w[0]} + \oint_{C_z[0]}\oint_{C_w[1,\infty]} + \oint_{C_z[1,\infty]}\oint_{C_w[0]} + \oint_{C_z[1,\infty]}\oint_{C_w[1,\infty]}.$$

These four contours may also be arranged such that $\Re(w+z) > 0$ unless both $w \in C_w[0]$ and $z \in C_z[0]$. Recall that

$$G(z;x,u) = \frac{u^z}{\Gamma(z+1)\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}(z+x))}.$$

Thus, the integrand of $I(t)$ converges to 0 as $t \to 0$ so long as $w \notin C_w[0]$ and $z \notin C_z[0]$. Consequently, each of the double contour integrals above except for the first has a limit value of 0 as $t \to 0$ since the limit operation may be interchanged with integration due to the integrals converging absolutely as argued above. To complete the proof it suffices to calculate

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^2} \oint_{C_z[0]} dz \oint_{C_w[0]} dw\, \frac{\pi}{2} \cdot \frac{G(w;x_1,tu_1)\,G(z;x_2,tu_2))}{w+z+x_2-x_1+1}. \tag{4.13}$$

The integral above may be evaluated via residues at $w=0$ and $z=0$. If $x_2 \neq x_1-1$ then (4.13) equals

$$\mathrm{Res}_{z=0}\left(\mathrm{Res}_{w=0}\left(\frac{(\pi/2)\,G(w;x_1,tu_1)\,G(z;x_2,tu_2)}{w+z+x_2-x_1+1}\right)\right) = \frac{2}{\pi}\frac{\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}x_2)\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}x_1)}{x_2-x_1+1}.$$

This provides the limiting value of $I(t)$ as $t \to 0$ as in the statement of the lemma for $x_2 \neq x_1-1$.

Now consider the limit (4.13) in the case $x_2 = x_1-1$. As the contour $C_w[0]$ can be arranged to be contained inside $C_z[0]$, the integral in w equals the residue of the integrand at the only possible pole at $w=0$. This equals

$$\mathrm{Res}_{w=0}\left(\frac{(\pi/2)\,G(w;x_1,tu_1)\,G(z;x_2,tu_2)}{w+z}\right) = \frac{\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}x_1)(tu_2)^z}{z\Gamma(z+1)\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}(z+x_2))}.$$

If x_1 is odd then the above equals 0. Otherwise, $\cos((\pi/2)x_1) = (-1)^{x_1/2}$ and the integral of the above over $C_z[0]$ is given by its residue at the pole $z=0$ (note that $\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}x_2) \neq 0$ since

$x_2 = x_1 - 1$ is odd). The residue equals

$$\mathrm{Res}_{z=0}\left(\frac{\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}x_1)(tu_2)^z}{z\Gamma(z+1)\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}(z+x_2))}\right) = \frac{\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}x_1)}{\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}x_2)} = -1.$$

Thus, if $x_2 = x_2 - 1$ then (4.13) equals $-\mathbf{1}_{\{x_1 \text{ even}\}}$ and this completes the proof. □

Proposition 4.3. *The kernel K_{edge} also has the following form.*

$$K_{\mathrm{edge}}(x_1,u_1;x_2,u_2) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{\pi}\int_1^0 t^{x_2-x_1}\cos\left(tu_1+\frac{\pi}{2}x_1\right)\cos\left(tu_2+\frac{\pi}{2}x_2\right)\,dt, & x_2 \geq x_1 \\ -\frac{2}{\pi}\int_1^\infty t^{x_2-x_1}\cos\left(tu_1+\frac{\pi}{2}x_1\right)\cos\left(tu_2+\frac{\pi}{2}x_2\right)\,dt, & x_2 < x_1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. For $t > 0$ let

$$f(t) = K_{\mathrm{edge}}(x_1,tu_1;x_2,tu_2) = t^{x_1-x_2-1}\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2,x_1>x_2\}}\frac{(u_2-u_1)^{x_1-x_2-1}}{(x_1-x_2-1)!} + I(t),$$

where $I(t)$ is as defined in Lemma 4.2. Lemma 4.2 implies that f is continuous differentiable on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Moreover, the argument from Lemma 4.2 shows that the function $t^{x_2-x_1+1}f(t)$ may be differentiated by interchanging the derivative with the integral. Differentiating $t^{x_2-x_1+1}f(t)$ and then clearing common powers of t gives

$$\begin{aligned}(x_2-x_1+1)f + tf' &= \frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^2}\oint_{C_z[0,\infty)} dz \oint_{C_w[0,\infty)} dw\,\frac{\pi}{2}\cdot G(w;x_1,tu_1)\,G(z;x_2,tu_2)) \\ &= \frac{\pi}{2}\cdot\frac{1}{2\pi\mathbf{i}}\oint_{C_w[0,\infty)} dw\,G(w;x_1,tu_1)\cdot\frac{1}{2\pi\mathbf{i}}\oint_{C_z[0,\infty)} dz\,G(z;x_2,tu_2)).\end{aligned}$$

The contour integrals can be evaluated by summing over residues of G. Inside the contour $C_z[0,\infty]$ the function $G(z,x,u)$ has simple poles at integers z such that $\sin(\pi(z+x)/2) = 0$. In other words, z having the same parity as x. Let $\bar{x} = \mathbf{1}_{\{x \text{ odd}\}}$. The residues of the integral result from integers $z = 2k + \bar{x}$ for $k \geq 0$. Since $\mathrm{Res}_{y=2k}(\sin(\pi y/2)^{-1}) = (2/\pi)(-1)^k$, summing over the residues gives

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2\pi\mathbf{i}}\oint_{C_z[0,\infty)} dw\,\frac{(tu)^z}{\Gamma(z+1)\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}(z+x))} &= \frac{2(-1)^{\frac{x+\bar{x}}{2}}}{\pi}\sum_{k\geq 0}(-1)^k\frac{(tu)^{2k+\bar{x}}}{(2k+\bar{x})!} \\ &= \frac{2(-1)^{\frac{x+\bar{x}}{2}}}{\pi}\cos\left(ut-\frac{\pi}{2}\bar{x}\right) \\ &= \frac{2}{\pi}\cos\left(ut+\frac{\pi}{2}x\right).\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$(x_2-x_1+1)f(t) + tf'(t) = \frac{2}{\pi}\cos\left(u_1t+\frac{\pi}{2}x_1\right)\cos\left(u_2t+\frac{\pi}{2}x_2\right). \tag{4.14}$$

Multiplying (4.14) by $t^{x_2-x_1}$ then implies that

$$[t^{x_2-x_1+1}f]' = \frac{2}{\pi}\,t^{x_2-x_1}\cos\left(u_1t+\frac{\pi}{2}x_1\right)\cos\left(u_2t+\frac{\pi}{2}x_2\right). \tag{4.15}$$

For $x_2 \geq x_1$, the r.h.s. of (4.15) is integrable over t in $[0,1]$. Moreover, $t^{x_2-x_1+1}f(t) \to 0$ as $t \to 0$ because $\lim_{t\to 0} f(t) = \lim_{t\to 0} I(t)$ and the latter limit is finite whereas $t^{x_2-x_1+1} \to 0$ as $t \to 0$. Therefore, (4.15) implies

$$f(1) = \frac{2}{\pi}\int_0^1 t^{x_2-x_1}\cos\Big(u_1 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1\Big)\cos\Big(u_2 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_2\Big)\,dt.$$

Next, consider the case $x_2 < x_1 - 1$. Now the relation in (4.15) should be integrated from 1 to ∞, which is convergent since $x_2 - x_1 \leq -2$. The formula follows so long as $\lim_{t\to\infty} t^{x_2-x_1+1}f(t) = 0$. Rather than derive this limit we take a slightly indirect approach by considering the limit of $f(t)$ near $t = 0$. For $t > 0$ define

$$\begin{aligned} g(t) &= -\frac{2}{\pi}\int_1^\infty s^{x_2-x_1}\cos(u_1 st + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\cos(u_2 st + \frac{\pi}{2}x_2)\,ds \\ &= -\frac{2}{\pi}\,t^{x_1-x_2-1}\int_t^\infty s^{x_2-x_1}\cos(u_1 s + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\cos(u_2 s + \frac{\pi}{2}x_2)\,ds. \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Upon differentiating g it follows readily that g satisfies the same differential equation as f displayed in (4.14). Therefore, $f(t) = g(t) + C$ for some constant C. In order to identity C as zero it suffices to show that $\lim_{t\to 0} f(t) - g(t) = 0$. Since $t^{x_1-x_2-1} \to 0$ as $t \to 0$ due to $x_2 < x_1 - 1$, $f(t)$ and $I(t)$ have the same limit as $t \to 0$. Thus, utilizing Lemma 4.2, showing $C = 0$ amounts to proving

$$\lim_{t\to 0} g(t) = \frac{2}{\pi}\,\frac{\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}x_2)}{x_2 - x_1 + 1}.$$

The limit of $g(t)$ can be found using L'Hôspital's rule, which shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t\to 0} g(t) &= \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{-\frac{2}{\pi}\int_t^\infty s^{x_2-x_1}\cos(u_1 s + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\cos(u_2 s + \frac{\pi}{2}x_2)\,ds}{t^{x_2-x_1+1}} \\ &= \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{\frac{2}{\pi}\,t^{x_2-x_1}\cos(u_1 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\cos(u_2 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_2)}{(x_2 - x_1 + 1)t^{x_2-x_1}} \\ &= \frac{2}{\pi}\,\frac{\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}x_2)}{x_2 - x_1 + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $g(t) = f(t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and in particular that $f(1) = g(1)$, as required.

Finally, consider the case $x_2 = x_1 - 1$. The r.h.s. of (4.15) is continuous for t in $[0,1]$ because one of $\cos(u_1 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)$ or $\cos(u_2 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_2)$ has a zero at $t = 0$ depending upon the parity of x_1. From Lemma 4.2, $\lim_{t\to 0} f(t) = \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{x_1 \text{ even}\}}$. Therefore, (4.15) implies that

$$f(1) = \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{x_1 \text{ even}\}} + \frac{2}{\pi}\int_0^1 t^{-1}\cos(u_1 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\cos(u_2 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_2)\,dt. \tag{4.17}$$

We now express (4.17) as an integral over $t \in [1,\infty)$ as given in the proposition. First, we remark that K_{edge} may be modified on the measure zero set consisting of $(x_1, u_1; x_2, u_2)$ such that $u_1 = u_2$ without changing determinants in (2.5), and thus, this does not affect the law of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$. We will modify the kernel on this zero set after the following calculations to get the form given in the proposition.

Observe that $\cos(u_2 t + \frac{\pi}{2} x_2) = \sin(u_2 t + \frac{\pi}{2} x_1)$ if $x_2 = x_1 - 1$. Using trigonometric formulae the integrand of (4.17) becomes

$$\frac{2\cos(u_1 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\sin(u_2 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)}{\pi t} = \begin{cases} \frac{\sin((u_1+u_2)t)+\sin((u_2-u_1)t)}{\pi t}, & x_1 \text{ even} \\ \frac{-\sin((u_1+u_2)t)+\sin((u_2-u_1)t)}{\pi t}, & x_1 \text{ odd.} \end{cases} \tag{4.18}$$

Using the fact that $\int_0^\infty \frac{\sin t}{t} = \frac{\pi}{2}$, we get that for $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\sin(at)}{\pi t}\, dt = \operatorname{sgn}(a) \int_0^{|a|} \frac{\sin t}{\pi t}\, dt = \frac{\operatorname{sgn}(a)}{2} - \int_1^\infty \frac{\sin(at)}{\pi t}\, dt. \tag{4.19}$$

Using (4.19) and the representation of the integrand in (4.18) we infer that if x_1 is even then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{x_1 \text{ even}\}} + \frac{2}{\pi}\int_0^1 t^{-1}\cos(u_1 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\sin(u_2 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\, dt = \\ &\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}} - 1 + \frac{\operatorname{sgn}(u_1+u_2)+\operatorname{sgn}(u_2-u_1)}{2} - \int_1^\infty \frac{\sin((u_1+u_2)t)+\sin((u_2-u_1)t)}{\pi t}\, dt = \\ &-\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1=u_2\}}(\frac{1+\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1=0\}}}{2}) - \frac{2}{\pi}\int_1^\infty t^{-1}\cos(u_1 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\sin(u_2 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\, dt. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that (4.17) equals the expression given in the statement of the proposition for $x_2 = x_1 - 1$ and x_1 even except for the additive term $-\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1=u_2\}}(\frac{1+\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1=0\}}}{2})$. By modifying K_{edge} on the zero set $\{u_1 = u_2, x_2 = x_1 - 1, x_1 \text{ even}\}$ we may ignore this term.

For x_1 being odd we argue in the same manner as above to infer that (4.17) equals

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{x_1 \text{ even}\}} + \frac{2}{\pi}\int_0^1 t^{-1}\cos(u_1 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\sin(u_2 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\, dt = \\ &\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1>u_2\}} - \frac{\operatorname{sgn}(u_1+u_2)+\operatorname{sgn}(u_1-u_2)}{2} + \int_1^\infty \frac{\sin((u_1+u_2)t)+\sin((u_1-u_2)t)}{\pi t}\, dt = \\ &= -\frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1=u_2>0\}}}{2} - \frac{2}{\pi}\int_1^\infty t^{-1}\cos(u_1 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\sin(u_2 t + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\, dt. \end{aligned}$$

Once again, we modify K_{edge} on the zero set $\{u_1 = u_2, x_2 = x_1 - 1, x_1 \text{ odd}\}$ to ignore the additive term $-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}_{\{u_1=u_2>0\}}$ and get the expression of the kernel given in the proposition. □

4.3. **Statistical properties of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$.** This section derives various properties of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ such as invariance and correlation decay from the integral representation of K_{edge}. The conclusions of Proposition 4.4, Proposition 4.6 and Lemma 4.7 will be helpful in deriving the local limit of staircase tableaux and sorting networks.

Proposition 4.4. *The process $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ has the following properties.*

I) Translation and reflection invariance: For any integer h the translated process

$$\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}} + (2h, 0) = \{(x + 2h, u) : (x, u) \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}\}$$

and the reflected process

$$(-1, 1) * \mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}} = \{(-x, u) : (x, u) \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}\}$$

have the same law as $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$.

II) One dimensional marginal: For $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$,

$$K_{\text{edge}}(x, u_1; x, u_2) = \frac{1}{\pi}\left(\frac{\sin(u_1 - u_2)}{u_1 - u_2} + (-1)^x \frac{\sin(u_1 + u_2)}{u_1 + u_2}\right); \quad \frac{\sin 0}{0} = 1. \tag{4.20}$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}} \cap (\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ is a determinantal process with reference measure $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ and correlation kernel (4.20).

Proof. Part I) From Lemma 2.2 the correlation kernel of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}} + (2h, 0)$ equals $K_{\text{edge}}(x_1 - 2h, u_1; x_2 - 2h, u_2)$. The integral representation of K_{edge} in Proposition 4.3 implies that

$$K_{\text{edge}}(x_1 - 2h, u_1; x_2 - 2h, u_2) = K_{\text{edge}}(x_1, u_1; x_2, u_2)$$

upon observing that $\cos(x + \pi h) = (-1)^h \cos(x)$, which implies that the integrands do not change after the kernel is transformed. Consequently, the translated point process has the same law as the original. Similarly, the correlation kernel for the reflected process is $K_{\text{edge}}(-x_1, u_1; -x_2; u_2) = (-1)^{x_1 - x_2} K_{\text{edge}}(x_1, u_1; x_2, u_2)$. The latter kernel defines the same determinantal process as $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ in law.

Part II) Proposition 4.3 gives that

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\text{edge}}(x, u_1; x, u_2) &= \frac{2}{\pi}\int_0^1 \cos(tu_1 + \frac{\pi}{2}x)\cos(tu_2 + \frac{\pi}{2}x)\, dt \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi}\left(\frac{\sin(tu_1 - tu_2)}{u_1 - u_2} + \frac{\sin(tu_1 + tu_2 + \pi x)}{u_1 + u_2}\right)\Bigg|_{t=0}^{t=1} \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi}\left(\frac{\sin(u_1 - u_2)}{u_1 - u_2} + (-1)^x \frac{\sin(u_1 + u_2)}{u_1 + u_2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The fact hat $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}} \cap (\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ is determinantal with kernel as stipulated follows from the relation (2.5) for determinantal processes. □

The following provides an estimate on the decay of K_{edge}. It will be used to establish tail-triviality of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$.

Lemma 4.5. *There is a universal constant C such that for $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$,*

$$|K_{\text{edge}}(x_1, u_1; x_2, u_2)| \leq \frac{C}{\max\{|x_1 - x_2|, |u_1 - u_2|\} + 1}. \tag{4.21}$$

Proof. Throughout this argument C denotes a universal constant whose value may change from line to line. We begin with the case $x_2 \neq x_1 - 1$. From the integral representation of K_{edge} we see that if $x_2 \geq x_1$ then

$$\begin{aligned} |K_{\text{edge}}(x_1, u_1; x_2, u_2)| &= \frac{2}{\pi}\left|\int_0^1 t^{x_2 - x_1}\cos(tu_1 + \frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\cos(tu_2 + \frac{\pi}{2}x_2)\, dt\right| \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\pi}\int_0^1 t^{x_2 - x_1}\, dt \leq \frac{C}{|x_2 - x_1| + 1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

Similarly, if $x_2 \le x_1$ then $x_2 \le x_1 - 2$ and

$$|K_{\text{edge}}(x_1,u_1;x_2,u_2)| = \frac{2}{\pi}\left|\int_1^\infty t^{x_2-x_1}\cos(tu_1+\frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\cos(tu_2+\frac{\pi}{2}x_2)\,dt\right| \le \frac{C}{|x_2-x_1|+1}. \tag{4.23}$$

Combining these bounds we deduce that if $x_2 \neq x_1 - 1$ then

$$|K_{\text{edge}}(x_1,u_1;x_2,u_2)| \le \frac{C}{|x_1-x_2|+1}. \tag{4.24}$$

Now we consider decay in the u-variables, again assuming that $x_2 \neq x_1 - 1$. Define $v(t)$ as

$$v(t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\sin(tu_1 - tu_2 + \frac{\pi}{2}(x_1-x_2))}{\pi(u_1-u_2)} + \dfrac{\sin(tu_1+tu_2+\frac{\pi}{2}(x_1+x_2))}{\pi(u_1+u_2)} & \text{if } u_1 \neq u_2 \\ \dfrac{t\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}(x_1-x_2))}{\pi} + \dfrac{\sin(tu_1+tu_2+\frac{\pi}{2}(x_1+x_2))}{\pi(u_1+u_2)} & \text{if } u_1 = u_2. \end{cases}$$

Then $v'(t) = \frac{2}{\pi}\cos(tu_1+\frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\cos(tu_2+\frac{\pi}{2}x_2)$. From the inequality $|\sin(y)/y| \le 1$ and the formula for $v(t)$ above observe that there is a C such that

$$|v(t)| \le \frac{C}{|u_1-u_2|+1} \text{ if } |u_1-u_2| \ge 1. \tag{4.25}$$

Applying integration by parts to the integral form of K_{edge} gives, for $x_2 \ge x_1$,

$$K_{\text{edge}}(x_1,u_1;x_2,u_2) = v(1) - v(0)\mathbf{1}_{\{x_1=x_2\}} - \int_0^1 (x_2-x_1)\,t^{x_2-x_1-1}\,v(t)\,dt.$$

Applying the triangle inequality to the above and using (4.25) imply that if $|u_1-u_2| \ge 1$ then

$$|K_{\text{edge}}(x_1,u_1;x_2,u_2)| \le \frac{C}{|u_1-u_2|+1} + \frac{C\,|x_2-x_1|}{|u_1-u_2|+1}\int_0^1 t^{x_2-x_1-1} \le \frac{2C}{|u_1-u_2|+1}.$$

If $|u_1-u_2| < 1$ then we use the bound (4.24) to reach the same conclusion as above. An entirely analogous bound holds for $K_{\text{edge}}(x_1,u_1;x_2,u_2)$ if $x_2 \le x_1$ since then $x_2 \le x_1 - 2$ and $t^{x_2-x_1}$ is integrable over $t \in [1,\infty)$. Therefore, for $x_2 \neq x_1 - 1$,

$$|K_{\text{edge}}(x_1,u_1;x_2,u_2)| \le \frac{C}{|u_1-u_2|+1}. \tag{4.26}$$

Combining (4.24) with (4.26) implies the required inequality (4.21) for $x_2 \neq x_1 - 1$.

The case $x_2 = x_1 - 1$ requires some care. The representation (4.18) for the integrand of $K_{\text{edge}}(x_1,u_1;x_1-1,u_2)$ gives

$$K_{\text{edge}}(x_1,u_1;x_1-1,u_2) = -\frac{2}{\pi}\int_1^\infty t^{-1}\cos(tu_1+\frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\sin(tu_2+\frac{\pi}{2}x_1)\,dt = -\int_1^\infty \frac{(-1)^{x_1}\sin((u_1+u_2)t)+\sin((u_2-u_1)t)}{\pi t}\,dt. \tag{4.27}$$

Applying integration by parts and then the triangle inequality implies that for $a \geq 1$,

$$\left| \int_1^\infty dt \, \frac{\sin(at)}{t} \right| = \left| \frac{\cos(a)}{a} - \int_1^\infty dt \, \frac{\cos(at)}{at^2} \right| \leq \frac{C}{a}.$$

For $0 \leq a \leq 1$ we also have

$$\left| \int_1^\infty dt \, \frac{\sin(at)}{t} \right| = \left| \frac{\pi}{2} - \int_0^1 dt \, \frac{\sin(at)}{t} \right| \leq C + \int_0^1 dt \, a \leq C.$$

Together, these bounds imply that for $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left| \int_1^\infty dt \, \frac{\sin(at)}{t} \right| \leq \frac{C}{|a|+1}. \tag{4.28}$$

Separating (4.27) naturally into two integrals and applying (4.28) implies that

$$|K_{\text{edge}}(x_1, u_1; x_1 - 1, u_2)| \leq \frac{C}{|u_1 - u_2| + 1}.$$

This establishes (4.21) for the case $x_2 = x_1 - 1$ and completes the proof. □

For $f : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}$, let $||f||_1 = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_0^\infty f(x,u) \, du$. For f such that $||f||_1 < \infty$ consider

$$N(f) = \sum_{(x,u) \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}} f(x,u).$$

$N(f)$ is finite almost surely because the relation (2.5) and the observation $|K_{\text{edge}}(x,u;x,u)| \leq (2/\pi)$ from (4.20) imply $\mathbb{E}\left[|N(f)|\right] \leq (2/\pi)||f||_1$. Also, for $A, B \subset \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ let

$$\text{dist}(A,B) = \inf \left\{ \max\{|x-y|, |u-v|\} : (x,u) \in A, (y,v) \in B \right\}.$$

For $A \subset \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ consider the sigma-algebra $\mathscr{F}(A) = \sigma(\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}} \cap A)$ generated by the points of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ restricted to A. The tail sigma-algebra is

$$\mathscr{F}_{\text{tail}} = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \mathscr{F}\big(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \setminus [-n,n] \times [0,n]\big).$$

Proposition 4.6. *Part I) Let A and B be disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Let $f : A \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g : B \to \mathbb{R}$ be functions with $||f||_1, ||g||_1 < \infty$. There is a universal constant C such that*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}\left[N(f)N(g)\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[N(f)\right]\mathbb{E}\left[N(g)\right] \right| \leq \frac{C}{\text{dist}(A,B)^2 + 1} \, ||f||_1 ||g||_1.$$

Part II) $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ is tail trivial, that is, if $E \in \mathscr{F}_{\text{tail}}$ then $\mathbb{P}[E] \in \{0,1\}$.

Proof. Part I) We may assume that both f and g are continuous and have compact support because we can approximate f and g in the L^1 norm by such functions and the upcoming estimates will depend only on the L^1 norm of the functions up to a universal constant (the constant C from Lemma 4.5). As A and B are disjoint,

$$N(f)N(g) = \sum_{\substack{(x_1,u_1),\,(x_2,u_1) \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}} \\ (x_1,u_1) \neq (x_2,u_1)}} f(x_1,u_1) g(x_2,u_1).$$

Let $\rho(x_1,u_1;x_2,u_2)=K_{\text{edge}}(x_1,u_1;x_2,u_2)K_{\text{edge}}(x_2,u_2;x_1,u_1)$. From the relation (2.5) for determinantal processes it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[N(f)N(g)\right]-\mathbb{E}\left[N(f)\right]\mathbb{E}\left[N(g)\right]=\int -\rho(x_1,u_1;x_2,u_2)fg\;d\,\#_{\mathbb{Z}^2}\otimes\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2_{\geq 0})(x_1,u_1;x_2;u_2).$$

Lemma 4.5 implies that if $(x_1,u_1)\in A$ and $(x_2,u_2)\in B$ then

$$|\rho(x_1,u_1;x_2,u_2)|\leq\frac{C}{\max\{|x_1-x_2|,|u_1-u_2|\}^2+1}\leq\frac{C}{\operatorname{dist}(A,B)^2+1}.$$

Since f and g are supported on A and B, respectively, the bound above on ρ implies

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbb{E}\left[N(f)N(g)\right]-\mathbb{E}\left[N(f)\right]\mathbb{E}\left[N(g)\right]|&\leq\int_A\int_B\frac{C\,|f(x_1,u_1)|\,|g(x_2,u_2)|}{\operatorname{dist}(A,B)^2+1}\\&=\frac{C}{\operatorname{dist}(A,B)^2+1}\,||f||_1||g||_1.\end{aligned}$$

Part II) From the conclusion of part (I) we infer that there is a constant C such that if E_A and E_B are $\mathscr{F}(A)$ and $\mathscr{F}(B)$ measurable events, respectively, and the sets A and B are disjoint then

$$\left|\mathbb{P}\left[E_A\cap E_B\right]-\mathbb{P}\left[E_A\right]\mathbb{P}\left[E_B\right]\right|\leq\frac{C}{\operatorname{dist}(A,B)^2+1}.\tag{4.29}$$

Set $A_n=[-n,n]\times[0,n]$ and $B_n=\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\setminus A_n$. Observe that $\operatorname{dist}(A_n,B_m)\geq m-n$ if $m\geq n$.

Now given an event $E\in\mathscr{F}_{\text{tail}}$ there exists a sequence of events $E_n\in\mathscr{F}(A_n)$ such that $\mathbb{P}\left[E\Delta E_n\right]\to 0$, where $E\Delta E_n$ is the symmetric difference of the sets. Suppose $E'\in\mathscr{F}(A_n)$ is an arbitrary event. Since the tail event $E\in\mathscr{F}(B_{m+n})$ for every $m\geq 1$, we infer from (4.29) that

$$\left|\mathbb{P}\left[E\cap E'\right]-\mathbb{P}\left[E\right]\mathbb{P}\left[E'\right]\right|\leq\frac{C}{m^2}.$$

Letting $m\to\infty$ implies that $\mathbb{P}\left[E\cap E'\right]=\mathbb{P}\left[E\right]\mathbb{P}\left[E'\right]$. Consequently,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[E\right]=\lim_n\mathbb{P}\left[E\cap E_n\right]=\lim_n\mathbb{P}\left[E\right]\mathbb{P}\left[E_n\right]=\mathbb{P}\left[E\right]^2.$$

This shows that $\mathbb{P}\left[E\right]\in\{0,1\}$ as required. □

Lemma 4.7. *Almost surely, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ has an unbounded collection of points on every line $\{x\}\times\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. In fact, the following holds. Let $N_x(t)=\#\big(\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}\cap(\{x\}\times[0,t])\big)$. For every x, the sequence $N_x(t)/t\to 1/\pi$ in probability as $t\to\infty$.*

Proof. Fix $x\in\mathbb{Z}$. Using part (II) of Proposition 4.4 we see that for any interval $[a,b]\subset\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[N_x([a,b])\right]=\int_a^b K_{\text{edge}}(x,u,x,u)\,du=\frac{b-a}{\pi}+\frac{(-1)^x}{2\pi}\int_{2a}^{2b}du\,\frac{\sin u}{u}\,.\tag{4.30}$$

Observe from (4.30) that $\mathbb{E}\left[N_x(t)/t\right]=1/\pi+O(1/t)$ as $t\to\infty$.

Next, we show that $\operatorname{Var}(N_x(t))\leq\mathbb{E}\left[N_x(t)\right]$. From (4.20) we see that $K_{\text{edge}}(x,u_1;x,u_2)$ is symmetric in the variables u_1 and u_2. Thus,

$$\rho(u_1,u_2):=K_{\text{edge}}(x,u_1;x,u_2)K_{\text{edge}}(x,u_2;x,u_1)=K_{\text{edge}}(x,u_1;x,u_2)^2\geq 0.$$

Now observer that $N_x(t) \cdot (N_x(t) - 1)$ counts the number of ordered pairs of distinct points of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ in the set $\{x\} \times [0, t]$. Therefore, relation (2.5) for determinantal processes gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[N_x(t) \cdot (N_x(t) - 1)\right] &= \int_0^t \int_0^t \det[K_{\text{edge}}(x, u_i; x, u_j)]_{i,j=1,2}\, du_1 du_2 \\ &= \left(\int_0^t K_{\text{edge}}(x, u; x, u)\, du\right)^2 - \int_0^t \int_0^t \rho(u_1, u_2)\, du_1 du_2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[N_x(t)\right]^2.\end{aligned}$$

This inequality implies that $\text{Var}(N_x(t)) = \mathbb{E}\left[N_x(t)^2\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[N_x(t)\right]^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\left[N_x(t)\right]$. Since $\mathbb{E}\left[N_x(t)\right] = (t/\pi) + O(1)$, we apply Chebyshev's ineqality to conclude that for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left|\frac{N_x(t)}{t} - \frac{1}{\pi}\right| > \epsilon\right] = \frac{O(1)}{\epsilon^2\, t}.$$

This provides the claimed convergence in probability.

Now convergence in probability implies that there is a sequence of times $t_k \to \infty$ such that $N_x(t_k)/t_k \to 1/\pi$ almost surely as $k \to \infty$. This in turn implies that there is an unbounded collection of points of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ on $\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ almost surely. An union bound over x provides the first claim of the lemma. □

5. The local staircase shaped tableau

The local staircase shaped tableau, henceforth, local tableau, is a random function on

$$\Delta_\infty = \left\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : y \geq 0,\, x \equiv y \pmod 2\right\}. \tag{5.1}$$

Figure 10 provides an illustration. The *rows* and *columns* of Δ_∞ are given by the diagonal lines

$$\text{row } 2x = \{(2x - k, k) : k \geq 0\}, \quad \text{column } 2x = \{(2x + k, k) : k \geq 0\}.$$



FIGURE 10. Black dots depicts cells of Δ_∞. Region bounded by the red lines is the embedding of Δ_8 into Δ_∞.

Consider the set of functions $F : \Delta_\infty \to [0, \infty]$ under the product topology whereby $F_m \to F$ if $F_m(x, y) \to F(x, y)$ for every $(x, y) \in \Delta_\infty$. Convergence of $F_m(x, y)$ is with respect to the usual metric on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ but trivially extended to $[0, \infty]$ by setting $|x - \infty| = \infty$ if $x \neq \infty$ and

$|\infty - \infty| = 0$. A random function $\mathbf{F} : \Delta_\infty \to [0, \infty]$ is a Borel probability measure on functions from Δ_∞ to $[0, \infty]$ in the product topology. A *tableau* is a function $T : \Delta_\infty \to [0, \infty]$ such that it satisfies the *tableau constraints*

$$T(x, y) \leq \min \{T(x-1, y+1), T(x+1, y+1)\} \quad \text{for every } (x, y) \in \Delta_\infty. \tag{5.2}$$

The YD Δ_n embeds into Δ_∞ via $(i, j) \in \Delta_n \mapsto (j - i - \mathbf{1}_{\{n \text{ odd}\}}, n - i - j) \in \Delta_\infty$. This amounts to putting row r of Δ_n on row $2(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - r)$ of Δ_∞; see Figure 10. In this manner any PYT T of shape Δ_n embeds as a function $F_T : \Delta_\infty \to [0, \infty]$ by setting

$$F_T(x, y) = \begin{cases} n\left(1 - T\left(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - \frac{x+y}{2}, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + \frac{x-y}{2}\right)\right) & \text{if } (\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - \frac{x+y}{2}, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + \frac{x-y}{2}) \in \Delta_n, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By an abuse of notation we denote the function F_T as T.

The set Δ_∞ can be made into a directed graph by putting directed edges from each vertex $(x, y) \in \Delta_\infty$ to the vertices $(x - 1, y + 1)$ and $(x + 1, y + 1)$. The automorphisms of this graph consists of translations ϕ_h, for $h \in \mathbb{Z}$, given by $\phi_h(x, y) = (x + 2h, y)$ and also a reflection ϕ_- given by $\phi_-(x, y) = (-x, y)$. Tableaux are preserved under these automorphisms. A random tableau $\mathbf{T}$ is *invariant* if $\mathbf{T} \circ \phi^{-1}$ has the same law as $\mathbf{T}$ for every automorphism ϕ. The tail sigma-algebra of $\mathbf{T}$ is

$$\mathscr{F}_{\text{tail}} = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \sigma\left(\mathbf{T}(x, y) : (x, y) \in \Delta_\infty \setminus \Delta_n\right).$$

We say $\mathbf{T}$ is tail trivial if $\mathscr{F}_{\text{tail}}$ is the trivial sigma-algebra.

5.1. **The local limit theorem.** Section 2.3 describes how PYT of a given shape are in bijection with ensembles of non-increasing and non-intersecting paths whose initial positions are given in terms of the shape. We describe the bijection explicitly for tableaux defined on Δ_∞ as it will be useful in the proof of the local limit theorem.

Consider an ensemble of paths $\{p(2x, u)\}$, for $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, that satisfy the following.

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{I) } p(x, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2} \text{ is left continuous, non-increasing with } p(x, 0) = 2x + \frac{1}{2}. \\ &\text{II) } p(x, \cdot) \text{ are non-intersecting: } p(x, u) > p(x - 1, u) \text{ for every } x \in \mathbb{Z}, u \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

For a tableau $T : \Delta_\infty \to [0, \infty]$, paths satisfying (5.3) are obtained by setting $p(x, u) = 2x + \frac{1}{2}$ for $0 \leq u \leq T(2x, 0)$, and for $k \geq 1$, $p(x, u) = p(x, 0) - k$ if $T(2x - k + 1, k - 1) < u \leq T(2x - k, k)$. In other words, $p(x, \cdot)$ is left continuous and decreases by integer units at times indexed by row $2x$ of T. Note that $p(x, \cdot)$ never jumps after the last finite entry on row $2x$. The ensemble of paths is non-intersecting due to the columns of T being non-decreasing. Indeed, $p(x, u) - p(x - 1, u) = 2 + N_{x-1}(u) - N_x(u)$, where $N_x(u)$ is the number of entries of T on row $2x$ with value at most u. Due to the columns being non-decreasing, $N_{x-1}(u) \geq N_x(u) - 1$, and thus $p(x, u) - p(x - 1, u) \geq 1$.

Let X denote the multiset of jumps as defined by (2.4) for the ensemble of paths associated to a tableau T on Δ_∞ . This is a discrete subset of $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Let $M_{T \to X}$ denote the map from tableaux defined on Δ_∞ to jumps of paths satisfying (5.3) as described. This map is invertible. If X is the multiset of jumps of an ensemble of paths satisfying (5.3) then the associated tableau

$T = M_{X\to T}(X)$ is obtained by setting for $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $k \geq 0$,

$$T(2x-k,k) = (k+1) - \text{th jump of } p(x,u) \text{ counted with multiplicity} = \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil - \text{th smallest point of } X \text{ on } \{2x-k\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \tag{5.4}$$

So $T(2x,0)$ is the 1-st point of X on $\{2x\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $T(2x-1,1)$ is the 1-st point of X on $\{2x-1\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and so forth. It is easy to verify that the rule (5.4) provides a tableau and inverts $M_{T\to X}$ when the ensemble of paths satisfy (5.3). Every jump of X is also used as an entry of T.

Lemma 5.1. *The set of jumps of paths satisfying (5.3) is closed in the topology of discrete subsets of $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. The map $M_{T\to X}$ is a homeomorphism from the set of tableaux on Δ_∞ to the set of jumps of paths satisfying (5.3), with inverse given by $M_{X\to T}$.*

Proof. The maps $M_{T\to X}$ and $M_{X\to T}$ are inverses of each other by design. We must show that they are continuous. We begin with the continuity of $M_{T\to X}$. Let T_n be a sequence of tableau such that $T_n \to T_\infty$. Observe that T_∞ is also a tableau as the tableau constraint (5.2) is closed in the product topology on functions. Let $X_n = M_{T\to X}(T_n)$ and $X_\infty = M_{T\to X}(T_\infty)$. We must show that $X_n \to X_\infty$. Every X_n and also X_∞ is the set of jumps of an ensemble of paths satisfying (5.3). Convergence of the X_n to X_∞ requires that for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $k \geq 1$, the k-th smallest point of X_n on $\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ must converge to the corresponding point of X_∞.

The main observation towards this end is the following, which follows from (5.4). Suppose X is the set of jumps of an ensemble of paths satisfying (5.3). Then (x,u) is the k-th smallest point of X on $\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ if and only if u is the time the path starting at initial position $(x+\frac{1}{2}) + 2k - 1 - \mathbf{1}_{\{x \text{ even}\}}$ jumps for the $(2k - \mathbf{1}_{\{x \text{ even}\}})$-th time. Indeed, this is the k-th path starting at or to the right of position $x+\frac{1}{2}$ and it hits position $x-\frac{1}{2}$ after jump number $2k - \mathbf{1}_{\{x \text{ even}\}}$. The first k jumps on $\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ are the times when the first k paths starting at or the right of position $x+\frac{1}{2}$ hits position $x-\frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, if $T = M_{X\to T}(X)$ then the jump (x,u) satisfies

$$u = T\big(x,\, 2k - 1 - \mathbf{1}_{\{x \text{ even}\}}\big). \tag{5.5}$$

Applying this observation leading to (5.5) to every X_n and X_∞, and using that $T_n(x,y) \to T_\infty(x,y)$ for every $(x,y) \in \Delta_\infty$, we conclude that $X_n \to X_\infty$. Therefore, $M_{T\to X}$ is continuous.

Now we show that the set of jumps of paths satisfying (5.3) is a closed set in the space of discrete subsets of $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and also that $M_{X\to T}$ is continuous. Suppose that a sequence of such a set of jumps, X_n, converges to a discrete subset X_∞. Let $T_n = M_{X\to T}(X_n)$. First we show that T_n converges. We have that $T_n(2x-k,k)$ is the $\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \rceil$-th smallest point of X_n on $\{2x-k\} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Therefore, convergence of X_n implies that T_n must converge to some function $T_\infty : \Delta_\infty \to [0,\infty]$. The function T_∞ must be a tableau because the tableau constraint (5.2) is closed. Thus, consider $\hat{X}_\infty = M_{T\to X}(T_\infty)$. By the first part of the proof, $X_n \to \hat{X}_\infty$. But then $\hat{X}_\infty = X_\infty$ because limits of discrete subsets of $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ are unique. This in turn shows both closure of jumps of paths satisfying (5.3) and continuity of $M_{X\to T}$. □

We now state the local limit theorem for Poissonzied staircase shaped tableaux. For $\alpha \in (-1,1)$ let $c_n = 2(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - \lfloor \frac{(1+\alpha)n}{2} \rfloor)$. For a PYT T having shape Δ_n, consider $T_{\alpha,n} : \Delta_\infty \to [0,\infty]$

defined by

$$T_{\alpha,n}(x,y) = \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\, T(x + c_n, y). \tag{5.6}$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_n$ be a uniformly random PYT of shape Δ_n and denote by $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,n}$ the random tableau associated to $\mathcal{T}_n$ by (5.6).

Theorem 5.2. *The sequence of random Poissonized tableaux $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,n}$ converges weak to a random tableau $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$. Moreover, the law of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ is $M_{X\to T}(\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}})$.*

Proof. Observe that $|c_n - \alpha n| \le 2$ for every n. With this choice of c_n the jump process associated to $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,n}$ has law $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n}$ from (1.4). Indeed, the jumps of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,n}$ are the jumps, as defined in (2.4), of the random Poissonized tableau $\mathcal{T}_{\Delta_n}$ rescaled onto $\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}$ as in (1.4). Theorem 4.1 asserts that $\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n}$ converges weakly to $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$. Due to being a weak limit of the jumps of ensembles of paths satisfying (5.3), $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ is also almost surely the jumps of such an ensemble of paths by the closure property given in Lemma 5.1. The continuity of $M_{X\to T}$, from Lemma 5.1, and the continuos mapping theorem for weak convergence then implies that $M_{X\to T}(\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n})$ converges weakly to $M_{X\to T}(\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}})$. Since $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,n}$ has law $M_{X\to T}(\mathcal{X}_{\alpha,n})$ we conclude that $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,n}$ converges in the local limit to a random tableau $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ having the law of $M_{X\to T}(\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}})$. □

Corollary 5.3. *Recall from (2.2) the uniformly random SYT on shape Δ_n with entries rescaled by $N+1$, denoted $\mathbf{T}^{\text{rsc}}_{\Delta_n}$. This rescaled tableau converges to $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ in the local limit.*

Proof. Applying Lemma 2.1 to staircase shaped tableaux implies that $d_{\text{BL}}(\mathcal{T}_{\Delta_n}, \mathbf{T}^{\text{rsc}}_{\Delta_n}) \le 2n^{-1/2}$. As a result, Theorem 5.2 implies $\mathbf{T}^{\text{rsc}}_{\Delta_n}$ also converges to $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ in the local limit because the limit involves finite dimensional distributions of the tableau entries as $n\to\infty$. □

5.2. **Statistical properties of the local tableau.** We record some properties of the local tableau that will be useful during the discussion on random sorting networks.

Theorem 5.4. *The local tableau $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ has the following properties.*

1. *Almost surely, $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}$ for every $(x,y)\in\Delta_\infty$ and also the entries of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ are all distinct.*
2. *The law of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ is invariant.*
3. *$\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ is tail trivial.*

Proof. Almost surely, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ has an infinite and unbounded collection of points on every line $\{x\}\times\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}$ by Lemma 4.7. Also, almost surely, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ does not contain two points of the form (x,u) and (y,u) with $x\ne y$. To see this observe from relation (2.5) for determinantal processes that the expected number of such pairs of points in $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ is 0 due to the set of such pairs having measure zero with respect to $\#\mathbb{Z}^2\otimes\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2_{\ge 0})$. When both these properties hold $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ satisfies (1).

Now we verify (2). The law of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ is invariant under translations because for every translation ϕ_h the tableau $\phi_h\cdot\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ is constructed from the jump process $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}+(2h,0)$, which has the same law of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ by Proposition 4.4. Reflection invariance of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ follows from reflection invariance of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$. Alternatively, it follows from the fact that the law of a uniform random PYT of shape Δ_n remains invariant if the rows and columns are transposed. Transposition becomes reflection when the cells of Δ_n are written in terms of the coordinate system of Δ_∞.

To establish tail triviality of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ we show that a tail event of the local tableau is the image of a tail event of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ under the map $M_{X\to T}$. Then tail triviality of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ from Proposition 4.6 implies tail triviality of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$. For even values of n, let $A_n \subset \mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ be defined by

$$A_n = M_{T\to X}(\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}(x,y) : (x,y) \in \Delta_n).$$

In other words, A_n consists of the first $n-i$ jumps of the path $p(n-2i,u)$ for every $1 \le i \le n-1$. Let $\mathscr{G}_n$ be the sigma-algebra generated by $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}} \setminus A_n$. It suffices to show that $\cap_n \mathscr{G}_n \subset \mathscr{F}_{\text{tail}}$, the latter being the tail sigma-algebra of $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$.

It is almost surely the case that for every $m \ge 1$, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ contains a finite number of points within the set $B_m = [-m,m] \times [0,m]$. Indeed, part (II) of Lemma 4.4 shows that $|K_{\text{edge}}(x,u,x,u)| \le 2/\pi$ and then relation (2.5) for determinantal processes implies that $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ contains at most $\frac{2}{\pi}(2m+1)m$ points inside B_m in expectation. Assuming that $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}$ always contains a finite number of points in every subset B_m it follows that for every m, $\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}} \cap B_m \subset A_n$ for all sufficiently large n. Therefore, $\cap_n \mathscr{G}_n \subset \mathscr{F}(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\ge 0} \setminus B_m)$ for every m and this shows that $\cap_n \mathscr{G}_n \subset \mathscr{F}_{\text{tail}}$, as required. □

6. Random sorting networks

6.1. **Sorting networks, Young tableaux and Edelman-Greene bijection.** Stanley [S] enumerated the number of sorting networks of $S(n)$ in the context of counting words in Coxeter groups. Recall Ω_n is the set of sorting networks of $S(n)$. Stanley showed that

$$|\Omega_n| = \frac{\binom{n}{2}!}{\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}(2n-1-2j)^j}. \tag{6.1}$$

Using the Hook formula one sees that the quantity above is also the number of SYT of shape Δ_n. Following Stanley, Edelman and Greene [EG] provided an explicit bijection between sorting networks and staircase shaped SYT. The following describes the part of the Edelman-Greene bijection mapping staircase shaped tableau to sorting networks. The inverse map is a modification of the RSK algorithm; we do not describe it here since it is not used in the paper. See [EG] or [AHRV, Section 4] for a full description of the bijection.

Recall that $\omega \in \Omega_n$ is identified by its sequence of swaps $(s_1,\dots,s_N)$, where $N = \binom{n}{2}$ and each s_i denotes the adjacent swap (s_i, s_i+1) at time i. For $T \in \mathrm{SYT}(\Delta_n)$, we adopt the convention that $T(i,j) = -\infty$ if $(i,j) \notin \Delta_n$.

The Schützenberger operator. Let $(i_{\max}(T), j_{\max}(T))$ denote the cell containing the maximum entry of a SYT T. The Schützenberger operator $\Phi : \mathrm{SYT}(\Delta_n) \to \mathrm{SYT}(\Delta_n)$ is a bijection defined as follows. Given $T \in \mathrm{SYT}(\Delta_n)$ construct the *sliding path* of cells $c_0, c_1, \dots, c_d \in \Delta_n$ iteratively in the following manner. Set $c_0 = (i_{\max}(T), j_{\max}(T))$ and $c_d = (1,1)$. Then set

$$c_{r+1} = \operatorname{argmax}\{T(c_r - (1,0)), T(c_r - (0,1))\}.$$

Let $\Phi(T) = [\hat{T}(i,j)]$ where $\hat{T}(c_r) = T(c_{r+1}) + 1$ for $0 \le r \le d-1$, $\hat{T}(c_d) = 1$, and $\hat{T}(i,j) = T(i,j) + 1$ for all other cells $(i,j) \in \Delta_n \setminus \{c_0,\dots,c_d\}$. Figure 11 provides an illustration.

The *Edelman-Greene map* $\mathrm{EG} : \mathrm{SYT}(\Delta_n) \to \Omega_n$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{EG}(T) = \Big(j_{\max}\big(\Phi^k(T)\big)\Big)_{0\le k\le N-1}, \tag{6.2}$$



FIGURE 11. First step of the Edelman-Greene algorithm on a staircase shaped SYT of size 10. The associated sorting network of $S(5)$ has swap sequence (2,4,3,1,2,1,4,3,2,4).

where Φ^k denotes the k-th iterate of Φ (recall that $N = \binom{n}{2}$).

Theorem 6.1 ([EG, Theorem 5.4])**.** *The map* $\mathrm{EG} : \mathrm{SYT}(\Delta_n) \to \Omega_n$ *has an inverse and provides a bijection between* $\mathrm{SYT}(\Delta_n)$ *and* Ω_n*.*

6.2. **First swap times of random sorting networks: proof of Corollary 1.3.** Let $T_{\mathrm{FS}}(x)$ be the first time the adjacent swap $(x, x+1)$ appears in a sorting network $\omega \in \Omega_n$. According to the Edelman-Greene bijection this time is recorded in the edge entry $(n-x, x)$ of $\mathrm{EG}(\omega)$. Thus,

$$T_{\mathrm{FS}}(x) = N + 1 - \mathrm{EG}(\omega)(n-x, x).$$

The Edelman-Greene bijection takes the law of the random sorting network of size n to the law of the uniformly random SYT $\mathbf{T}_{\Delta_n}$ of shape Δ_n. Therefore, in terms of the rescaled tableau $\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_{\Delta_n}$ we have

$$\frac{2}{n}\,\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{FS}}(x) \overset{law}{=} \frac{2N+2}{n^2}\,\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_{\Delta_n}(n-x, x).$$

This provides the following equality of laws for $\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{FS},\alpha,n}$, which is the first time the adjacent swap $(\lfloor\frac{(1+\alpha)n}{2}\rfloor, \lfloor\frac{(1+\alpha)n}{2}\rfloor + 1)$ appears in the random sorting network of size n:

$$\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{FS},\alpha,n} \overset{law}{=} \frac{2N+2}{n^2}\,\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_{\alpha,\Delta_n}(0,0).$$

Here, $\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_{\alpha,\Delta_n}$ is the rescaled and re-centered uniformly random SYT of shape Δ_n as defined by (2.2), and embedded as a tableau on Δ_∞ as given by (5.6). Corrollary 5.3 implies that $\mathbf{T}^{\mathrm{rsc}}_{\alpha,\Delta_n}(0,0)$ converges weakly to $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{edge}}(0,0)$. Since $(2N+2)/n^2 \to 1$, we conclude that $\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{FS},\alpha,n}$ converges weakly to $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{edge}}(0,0)$, which provides the limiting law $\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{FS}}$ of $\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{FS},\alpha,n}$.

Now we prove the representation of the law of $\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{FS}}$ given in (1.1). Observe that the event $\{\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{FS}}(0) > t\}$ is equivalent to the event $\{\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{edge}} \cap (\{0\} \times [0,t]) = \emptyset\}$. The probability of the latter event has the representation given in (1.1), which is a Fredholm determinant. This is a well-known fact about determinantal processes under sufficient conditions on the kernel but we provide a summary of the argument for completeness.

The inclusion-exclusion principle gives that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}\cap(\{0\}\times[0,t])=\emptyset\}} &= 1+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(-1)^k \sum_{X\subset\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}},\,|X|=k} \mathbf{1}_{\{X\subset\{0\}\times[0,t]\}} \\ &= 1+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \sum_{\substack{(0,u_1),\dots,(0,u_k)\in\mathcal{X}_{\text{edge}}\\ u_i \text{ distinct}}} \prod_{i=1}^{k}\mathbf{1}_{\{u_i\in[0,t]\}}.\end{aligned}$$

The representation (1.1) follows from taking expectation of the above, interchanging expectation with summation and employing the relation (2.5) for determinantal processes. Justification for interchanging expectation with summation comes by way of the dominated convergence since the sum above is absolutely convergent in expectation. This follows from Hadamard's inequality for determinants and the fact that $|K_{\text{edge}}(0,u_1;0,u_2)|\le 2/\pi$. For details see [La, Chapter 24]. We conclude with a lower bound on the tail probability of $\mathbf{T}_{\text{FS}}$.

Proposition 6.2. *There is a constant c such that for $t\ge 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mathbf{T}_{\text{FS}}>t\right]\ge e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}-ct}.$$

Proof. Let $s(u_1,u_2)=\frac{\sin(u_1-u_2)}{\pi(u_1-u_2)}$ and S be the integral operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with kernel s, that is, $Sf(u)=\int_{\mathbb{R}} s(u,v)f(v)\,dv$. It is classical that S is the projection of the Fourier transform onto $L^2([-1,1])$. In particular, S is self-adjoint, positive semi-definite and has operator norm 1.

Let K be the integral operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0})$ with kernel $K_{\text{edge}}(0,u_1;0,u_2)$. For $f\in L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0})$ let f_{even} be the extension of f onto $\mathbb{R}$ as an even function. The map $f\to f/\sqrt{2}$ is a Hilbert space isomorphism between $L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0})$ and the subspace of even functions, $L^2_{\text{even}}(\mathbb{R})$, of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

We show that this isomorphism maps K to S. First, observe that S maps even functions to even functions because $\frac{\sin(u)}{\pi u}$ is even. Thus $L^2_{\text{even}}(\mathbb{R})$ is an invariant subspace for S. Next, observe that $K_{\text{edge}}(0,u_1;0,u_2)=s(u_1,u_2)+s(u_1,-u_2)$. Thus, changing variables $u_2\to -u_2$ in the integration against $s(u_1,-u_2)$ shows that $Kf(u)=Sf_{\text{even}}(u)$ for $u\in\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}$. To conclude that K is mapped to S we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle Kf,g\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0})} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}} Sf_{\text{even}}(u)g(u)\,du \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} Sf_{\text{even}}(u)g_{\text{even}}(u)\,du \\ &= \left\langle S\left(\frac{f_{\text{even}}}{\sqrt{2}}\right),\frac{g_{\text{even}}}{\sqrt{2}}\right\rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}.\end{aligned}$$

The representation of $\mathbb{P}\left[\mathbf{T}_{\text{FS}}>t\right]$ in (1.1) is the Fredholm determinant (see [La, Chapter 24]) of the integral operator $P_{[0,t]}KP_{[0,t]}$ acting on $L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0})$, where P_I denotes the projection operator onto $L^2(I)$ for an interval I. Let $\det(I-P_{[0,t]}KP_{[0,t]})$ denote this determinant. The aforementioned isomorphism of Hilbert spaces maps $P_{[0,t]}$ to $P_{[-t,t]}$ acting on $L^2_{\text{even}}(\mathbb{R})$. Consequently,

$$\det\left(I-P_{[0,t]}KP_{[0,t]}\right)\big|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0})}=\det\left(I-P_{[-t,t]}SP_{[-t,t]}\right)\big|_{L^2_{\text{even}}(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Since S is self-adjoint, positive-semidefinite and has norm 1 the spectrum of S as an L^2 operator is contained inside the interval $[0,1]$. The same conclusion holds for $P_{[-t,t]}SP_{[-t,t]}$.

Combining this with the fact that $L^2_{\text{even}}(\mathbb{R})$ is a closed subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and invariant for S we infer the following from the trace representation of the log of the Fredholm determinant (see [La, Chapter 24, Theorem 8]):

$$\det\left(I - P_{[-t,t]}SP_{[-t,t]}\right)\big|_{L^2_{\text{even}}(\mathbb{R})} \geq \det\left(I - P_{[-t,t]}SP_{[-t,t]}\right)\big|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Widom [Wi] proves that there is a constant c such that for any interval I of length $|I|$,

$$\left|\log\det(I - P_I S P_I)\,|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} + \frac{|I|^2}{8}\right| \leq c|I|.$$

This establishes the proposition by taking $I = [-t, t]$. □

6.3. **Edelman-Greene algorithm on the local tableau.** The procedure described here is the same as the one given in the Introduction except that it is in the language of tableaux instead of their jumps. In order to define the Edelman-Greene algorithm on the local tableau we first introduce some concepts that allow us to define Edelman-Greene algorithm on tableaux defined on Δ_∞.

A *directed path* from $(x, y) \in \Delta_\infty$ to $(x', y') \in \Delta_\infty$ is a sequence of cells $c_0 = (x, y), c_1, \ldots, c_k = (x', y')$ of Δ_∞ such that $c_{i+1} - c_i \in \{(-1, 1), (1, 1)\}$ for every i. The cells of Δ_∞ can be partially ordered as follows: $(x, y) \leq (x', y')$ if there is a directed path from (x, y) to (x', y'). Recall that Δ_∞ is a directed graph with edges from (x, y) to $(x \pm 1, y + 1)$. It can also be thought of as an undirected graph by forgetting the direction of the edges. A *connected* subset of Δ_∞ is a connected subgraph of Δ_∞ in the undirected sense.

A *Young diagram* (YD) of Δ_∞ is a connected subset λ that is downward closed in the partial order, that is, if $(x, y) \in \lambda$ and $(x', y') \leq (x, y)$ then $(x', y') \in \lambda$. For example, Δ_n is a YD of Δ_∞. The *boundary* of λ, $\partial\lambda$, consists of cells $(x, y) \notin \lambda$ such that there is a directed edge from some cell $(x', y') \in \lambda$ to (x, y). The *peaks* of λ consists of the maximal cells of λ in the partial order.

Let $T : \Delta_\infty \to [0, \infty]$ be a tableau as in (5.2). A *sub-tableau* is the restriction of T to a YD λ; we say λ is the *support* of the sub-tableau. Let $T^{\text{finite}} = \{T(x, y) : T(x, y) \neq \infty\}$. We take the support of T to be the support of T^{finite}. Observe that T^{finite} is a countable disjoint union of sub-tableau of T, say $T_1, T_2, \ldots$. Indeed, the support of the T_is are the connected components of the subgraph spanned by cells (x, y) such that $T(x, y) \neq \infty$. We denote the T_i as the *clusters* of T. The tableau T is *EG-admissible* if all entries of T^{finite} are distinct and every cluster T_i is supported of a YD of **finite size**.

Edelman-Greene algorithm on a finite tableau. Let λ be a YD of Δ_∞ of finite size and $T : \lambda \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ a tableau such that all its entries are distinct. The Edelman-Greene map EG takes as input T and outputs a triple $(x, t, \hat{T})$, where $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\hat{T}$ is a sub-tableau.

The sliding path of T is a directed path $c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_k$ defined by

(1) $c_0 = \text{argmin}\,\{\, T(x, y) : (x, y) \in \lambda\}$.
(2) $c_{i+1} = \text{argmin}\,\{\, T(c_i + (-1, 1)), T(c_i + (1, 1))\,\}$.
(3) $c_k =$ peak of λ obtained when both $c_k + (\pm 1, 1) \in \partial\lambda$.

Let $\hat{\lambda} = \lambda \setminus \{c_k\}$ and define $\hat{T} : \hat{\lambda} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$\hat{T}(x,y) = \begin{cases} T(x,y) & \text{if } (x,y) \in \hat{\lambda} \setminus \{c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}\} \\ T(c_{i+1}) & \text{if } (x,y) = c_i \text{ for some } 0 \leq i \leq k-1. \end{cases}$$

The cell c_0 must be on the bottom level of Δ_∞ and has the form $(2x, 0)$ for some $x \in \mathbb{Z}$. Set $t = T(c_0)$. The output is $\mathrm{EG}(T) = (x, t, \hat{T})$, and empty if T is the empty tableau.

The Edelman-Greene algorithm on T outputs a discrete subset $S(T) \subset \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, denoted the *swaps* of T. Let (x_j, t_j, T_j), for $1 \leq j \leq |\lambda|$, be defined iteratively by $(x_1, t_1, T_1) = \mathrm{EG}(T)$ and $(x_j, t_j, T_j) = \mathrm{EG}(T_{j-1})$ for $2 \leq j \leq |\lambda|$. Then

$$S(T) = \{(x_j, t_j) : 1 \leq j \leq |\lambda|\}. \tag{6.3}$$

If the cell $(x, y) \in \lambda$ contains the k-th smallest entry of T then its entry is removed during the k-th iteration of the algorithm. We say that the entry at (x, y) *exits* at time t_k from row x_k. We also say that (x_k, t_k) *originates* from cell (x, y).

Edelman-Greene algorithm on admissible tableau. Let $T_1, T_2, \dots$ be the clusters of an EG-admissible tableau T. Observe that for $i \neq j$ the swaps of T_i and T_j exit from mutually disjoint rows. Thus the swap sets $S(T_1), S(T_2), \dots$ are row-wise mutually disjoint. The swaps of T are defined as

$$S(T) = \bigcup_i S(T_i).$$

The local tableau is not EG-admissible. In order to define swaps of the local tableau we must cut off large entries so that it becomes EG-admissible and then process the tableau is a graded manner. For this to be successful the EG algorithm ought to be consistent in the sense that running it on a tableau and then restricting to swaps that originate from a sub-tableau must produce the same outcome as the algorithm applied to the sub-tableau. This is not always the case and the following explains when it may be so.

Given two tableaux T_{small} and T_{big} we say $T_{\mathrm{small}} \leq T_{\mathrm{big}}$ if the following criterion hold.

(1) $T_{\mathrm{small}}(x, y) = T_{\mathrm{big}}(x, y)$ for every $(x, y) \in \mathrm{support}(T_{\mathrm{small}})$.
(2) For every $(x, y) \in \mathrm{support}(T_{\mathrm{small}})$ and $(x', y') \in \mathrm{support}(T_{\mathrm{big}}) \setminus \mathrm{support}(T_{\mathrm{small}})$, if (x, y) belongs to the same cluster of T_{big} as (x', y') then $T_{\mathrm{small}}(x, y) < T_{\mathrm{big}}(x', y')$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $T_{\mathrm{small}} \leq T_{\mathrm{big}}$ and suppose T_{big} is EG-admissible. Then applying the EG algorithm to T_{big} and restricting to the swaps that originate from the cells of T_{small} produces the same outcome as the EG algorithm applied to T_{small}. In particular, $S(T_{\mathrm{small}}) \subset S(T_{\mathrm{big}})$.*

Proof. Observe that the clusters of T_{small} are contained within the clusters of T_{big}. The EG algorithm acts independently on each cluster of T_{big} is a row-wise disjoint manner. Fix a particular cluster T of T_{big} and suppose that the clusters of T_{small} contained inside T are $T_1, \dots, T_k$. It suffices to prove that the EG algorithm applied to T and then restricted to the swaps that originate from $T_1, \dots, T_k$ produces the same outcome as the algorithm applied to each individual T_i.

Let $\lambda = \mathrm{support}(T)$ and $\lambda_i = \mathrm{support}(T_i)$. The assumption is that any entry of $\lambda \setminus (\cup_i \lambda_i)$ is larger than every entry of $\cup_i \lambda_i$. Therefore, the EG algorithm applied to T will process every entry of $\cup_i \lambda_i$ before it ever processes any entry from the complement. When some entry from

$\lambda \setminus (\cup_i \lambda_i)$ enters a cell of some λ_i during the first $\sum_i |\lambda_i|$ steps, the algorithm treats that entry as if it were ∞. Since T_{small} agrees with T_{big} on $\cup_i \lambda_i$ the EG algorithm will thus output the swaps of $T_1, \dots, T_k$ during the first $\sum_i |\lambda_i|$ steps and then produce the remaining swaps of $T \setminus (\cup_i T_i)$. This is what was claimed. □

A tableau T is *graded EG-admissible* if its finite valued entries are distinct and if for every $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ the sub-tableau

$$T^{\leq t} = \{T(x,y) : T(x,y) \leq t\} \quad \text{is EG-admissible.}$$

Observe that $T^{\leq t_1} \leq T^{\leq t_2}$ whenever $t_1 \leq t_2$. Lemma 6.3 then implies that $S(T^{\leq t_1}) \subset S(T^{\leq t_2})$. Therefore, for a graded EG-admissible tableau we may define

$$S(T) = \bigcup_{t \geq 0} S(T^{\leq t}). \tag{6.4}$$

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose a sequence of tableau $T_n \to T_\infty$ and that every T_n and T_∞ are graded EG-admissible. For every integer x and value $t \geq 0$ there is a finite YD λ such that it contains the cluster of $(2x, 0)$ in $T_n^{\leq t}$ for every n.*

Proof. It follows from a diagonalization argument, more precisly König's infinity lemma, which states that every infinite connected graph with finite vertex degrees contains an infinite path.

Suppose for the sake of a contradiction that the conclusion of the lemma fails. Let $T_{n,x,t}$ denote the cluster of $(2x, 0)$ in $T_n^{\leq t}$. Call a cell $(x', y') \in \Delta_\infty$ bad if there is a undirected path in Δ_∞ from $(2x, 0)$ to (x', y') that is contained in infinitely many of the clusters $T_{n,x,t}$. Consider the connected component of $(2x, 0)$ in Δ_∞ that is spanned by the subgraph of bad vertices. If the component is finite then there is a finite YD λ that contains the component. This implies that for all sufficiently large n, every cell of $\partial\lambda$ lies outside $T_{n,x,t}$ because any path from $(2x, 0)$ to a cell outside λ must pass thorough $\partial\lambda$. Therefore, $T_{n,x,t} \subset \lambda$ for all large n. Since every T_n is graded EG-admissible this actually means that there is a finite YD that contains every $T_{n,x,t}$, which is a contradiction.

Therefore the connected component of $(2x, 0)$ spanned by the bad vertices is infinite. Since every vertex of Δ_∞ has degree at most 4 König's lemma provides an infinite path of (distinct) bad vertices $(x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_1), \dots$ starting from $(x_0, y_0) = (2x, 0)$. By definition of being bad there is a path from $(2x, 0)$ to (x_m, y_m) for every m that is contained in some infinite subsequence of the clusters $T_{n_i^m,x,t}$ with $n_i^m \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$. Let ℓ_m be the length of this path. Observe that $\ell_m \to \infty$ with m because the distance from $(2x, 0)$ to (x_m, y_m) in Δ_∞ must tend to infinity since every vertex has degree at most 4.

The YD λ_m formed by the cells of Δ_∞ that are at or below the cells on the path from $(2x, 0)$ to (x_m, y_m) must be contained in every cluster $T_{n_i^m,x,t}$. Since T_n converges to T_∞ this implies that $\lambda_m \subset T_{\infty,x,t}$ for every m. Since $|\lambda_m| \geq \ell_m \to \infty$ we conclude that $T_{\infty,x,t}$ is infinite. However, this is a contradiction to T_∞ being graded EG-admissible. □

Theorem 6.5. *Suppose a sequence of tableau $T_n \to T_\infty$ and that every T_n and T_∞ are graded EG-admissible. Then $S(T_n) \to S(T_\infty)$ as discrete subsets of $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.*

Proof. Compact subsets of $\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ are finite disjoint union of sets of the from $\{x\}\times C$ for $x\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $C\subset\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ compact. Therefore, we must show that for every such x and C

$$\limsup_n \ \#\left[S(T_n)\cap(\{x\}\times C)\right]\leq \#\left[S(T_\infty)\cap(\{x\}\times C)\right].$$

Fix a $t>0$ such that $C\subset[0,t]$.

Suppose T is a graded EG-admissible tableau. The swaps of T on $\{x\}\times[0,t]$ are the entries of $T^{\leq t}$ that exit from row x. Let $T_{x,t}$ denote the cluster of $(2x,0)$ in $T^{\leq t}$. By Lemma 6.3 the swaps of T on $\{x\}\times[0,t]$ are determined completely from running the EG algorithm on $T_{x,t}$. From Lemma 6.4 and that fact that T_∞ if graded EG-admissible we deduce that there is a finite YD λ such that

$$\text{support}(T_{n,x,t})\subset\lambda \ \text{ for every } \ n \ \text{ and } \ \text{support}(T_{\infty,x,t})\subset\lambda.$$

Since $\sup_{(x',y')\in\lambda}|T_n(x',y')-T_\infty(x',y')|\to 0$, we conclude that the following must occur for all sufficiently large n.

(1) The order of the entries of T_n on λ stabilizes to the order of the entries of T_∞ on λ.
(2) For every $(x',y')\in\lambda$ if $T_\infty(x',y')\notin C$ then $T_n(x',y')\notin C$.

Once condition (1) holds then due to $T_{n,x,t}\subset\lambda$, a swap from $S(T_n)$ lies on $\{x\}\times C$ if and only if there is a cell $(x',y')\in\lambda$ such that $T_n(x',y')\in C$ and when the EG algorithm is applied to T_∞ restricted to λ the entry at cell (x',y') exits from row x. The same conclusion holds for swaps of $S(T_\infty)$ on $\{x\}\times C$. This property along with condition (2) then implies that

$$S(T_n)\cap(\{x\}\times C)\subset S(T_\infty)\cap(\{x\}\times C) \ \text{ for all large } \ n.$$

This completes the proof. □

6.4. **Completing the proof of Theorem 1.2.** Theorem 1.2 will follow from Theorem 6.5 and the following lemma.

Lemma 6.6. *The local tableau $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ is almost surely graded EG-admissible.*

Proof. The entries of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ are finite and distinct by condition (1) of Theorem 5.4. We must show that almost surely the clusters of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}^{\leq t}$ are finite for every t. Suppose that the local tableau has the following property almost surely: for every t and x there are integers $a,b\geq 0$ such that $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}(2x-2a,0)>t$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}(2x+2b,0)<t$. Assuming this we observe that the tableau constraint implies that the cluster of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}^{\leq t}$ containing $(2x,0)$ must be contained within cells whose row and column indices are both between $2x-2a$ and $2x+2b$. The set of such cells is finite and so the cluster of every bottom level cell in $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}^{\leq t}$ is finite. Now if $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}(2x-k,k)\leq t$ then cell $(2x-k,k)$ belongs to the same cluster as $(2x,0)$ in $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}^{\leq t}$ since the row entries are non-decreasing. This implies that $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}^{\leq t}$ is EG-admissible for every t.

Now we prove the aforementioned assumption on $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$. By a union (or rather intersection) bound over every integer x and rational values of t it suffices to prove that the assumption holds for every fixed x and t, almost surely. By translation invariance of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ if also suffice to take $x=0$. If the assumption now fails then with positive probability it can be the case that either $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}(-2a,0)\leq t$ for every $a\geq 0$ or $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}(2b,0)\leq t$ for every $b\geq 0$. Suppose the former case holds. The event $\{\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}(-2a,0)\leq t \ \text{ for every } \ a\geq 0\}$ is a tail event of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$. By tail triviality

(property (3) of Theorem 5.4) this event must then have probability 1. This is impossible due to Proposition 6.2 which shows that $\mathbb{P}\left[\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}(0,0) > t\right] > 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. The law of $S_{\alpha,n}$ is that of the Edelman-Greene algorithm applied to the rescaled uniformly random staircase shaped tableau $\mathbf{T}^{\text{rsc}}_{\Delta_n}$ from (2.2). Corollary 5.3 asserts that $\mathbf{T}^{\text{rsc}}_{\Delta_n}$ converges weakly to $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ as a tableau embedded in Δ_∞. By Skorokhod's representation theorem there exists random tableau $\mathcal{T}_n$ and $\mathcal{T}_\infty$ defined on a common probability space such that $\mathcal{T}_n$ has the law of $\mathbf{T}^{\text{rsc}}_{\Delta_n}$, $\mathcal{T}_\infty$ has the law of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_n \to \mathcal{T}_\infty$ almost surely.

The tableaux $\mathbf{T}^{\text{rsc}}_{\Delta_n}$ are trivially graded EG-admissible almost surely. Since $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ is also graded EG-admissible by Lemma 6.6 we may assume that almost surely every $\mathcal{T}_n$ and $\mathcal{T}_\infty$ are graded EG-admissible. Theorem 6.5 now implies that $S(\mathcal{T}_n)$ converges almost surely to $S(\mathcal{T}_\infty)$. This in turn implies that $S_{\alpha,n}$, which has the law of $S(\mathcal{T}_n)$, converges weakly to $S(\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}})$, which is the law of $S(\mathcal{T}_\infty)$. This completes the proof of convergence of the local swap process. □

We conclude with some statistical properties of the local sorting network.

Theorem 6.7. *The local sorting network S_{local} has the following properties.*

1. *S_{local} is invariant under translations and reflection of the $\mathbb{Z}$-coordinate.*
2. *S_{local} is stationary in the time coordinate.*
3. *S_{local} is tail trivial in in the sense that the sigma-algebra*

$$\bigcap_{n\geq 0} \sigma\Big((x,t) \in S_{\text{local}} : |x| > n \ \text{ or } \ t > n\Big) \ \text{ is trivial.}$$

Proof. We have that $S_{\text{local}} = S(\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}})$ in law. Thus, invariance of S_{local} under translations and reflection of the $\mathbb{Z}$-coordinate follows directly from the corresponding invariance of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ from Theorem 5.4. Namely, applying a $\mathbb{Z}$-automorphism to S_{local} is the same as first applying it to $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ and then applying the EG algorithm to the resulting tableau.

Time stationarity of S_{local} is a consequence of the stationarity of finite random sorting networks [AHRV, Theorem 1(i)], as we explain. If $(s_1, \dots, s_N)$ is the sequence of swaps of the random sorting network of size n, then $(s_1, \dots, s_{N-1})$ has the same law as $(s_2, \dots, s_N)$. To see this observe that the map

$$(s_1^\omega, \dots, s_N^\omega) \in \Omega_n \to (s_2^\omega, \dots, s_N^\omega, n - s_1^\omega)$$

is a bijection of Ω_n into itself, and therefore, it preserves the uniform measure. Stationary of finite random sorting networks implies stationary of S_{local} in time since it is preserved under weak convergence. We remark that although stationary follows trivially from finite random sorting networks we actually do not obtain it from the description of S_{local} as $S(\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}})$.

If remains to verify tail-triviality of S_{local}. Let $\mathscr{F}_n$ denote the sigma-algebra of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ generated by the entries on $\Delta_\infty \setminus \Delta_n$. Let $\mathscr{G}_n$ denote the sigma-algebra of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ generated by entries having value larger than n. By the nature of the EG algorithm, any event that is measurable with respect to the swaps of S_{local} outside of the set $[-n, n] \times [0, n]$ must be an image of an event in the sigma-algebra generated by $\mathscr{F}_{2n} \cup \mathscr{G}_n$. Indeed, any such swap of S_{local} must either originate from an entry of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ with value larger than n, or, it must exit from some row x with $|x| > n$, that is, from a bottom level cell of Δ_∞ of the form $(2x, 0)$ with $|x| > n$. In the latter case the sliding path of said entry must be located in $\Delta_\infty \setminus \Delta_{2n}$ because any entry that exits from row x with $|x| > n$ can never hit Δ_{2n}.

Tail-triviality of S_{local} follows from tail triviality of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ if both $\cap_n \mathscr{F}_n$ and $\cap_n \mathscr{G}_n$ are contained in the tail sigma-algebra of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$. Since $\cap_n \mathscr{F}_n$ is the tail sigma-algebra of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ by definition, it suffices to show this for $\cap_n \mathscr{G}_n$. Towards this end we use that the entries of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ are finite almost surely. Therefore, for every m, the entries of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ restricted to Δ_m have value at most n for all sufficiently large n. Thus, $\cap_n \mathscr{G}_n \subset \mathscr{F}_m$ for every m. This implies that $\cap_n \mathscr{G}_n$ is contained in the tail sigma-algebra of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{edge}}$ and completes the proof. □

References

[AGH] O. Angel, V. Gorin, and A. E. Holroyd. A pattern theorem for random sorting networks. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, **17**(99) (2012), pp. 1–16. arXiv:1110.0160.

[ADHV] O. Angel, D. Dauvergne, A. E. Holroyd, and B. Virág, The Local Limit of Random Sorting Networks, in preparation.

[AH] O. Angel and A. E. Holroyd. Random subnetworks of random sorting networks. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, **17**(1):paper 23, 2010, arXiv:0911.2519

[AHR] O. Angel, A. Holroyd and D. Romik, The oriented swap process, *Annals of Probability* **37** (2009), pp. 1970–1998. arXiv:0806.2222.

[AHRV] O. Angel, A. Holroyd, D. Romik and B. Virág, Random sorting networks, *Advances in Mathematics* **215**(2) (2007), pp. 839–864.

[BDJ] J. Baik, P. Deift, and K. Johansson, On the distribution of the length of the longest increasing subsequence of random permutations, *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, **12** no. 4 (1999), pp. 1119–1178. arXiv:math/9810105.

[B] A. Borodin, Determinantal point processes, *Oxford Handbook of Random Matrix Theory*, Oxford University Press, 2011, arXiv:0911.1153.

[BG] A. Borodin, V. Gorin, Lectures on Integrable probability. In: Probability and Statistical Physics in St. Petersburg, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, Vol. 91, 155–214. AMS 2016. arXiv:1212.3351.

[BOO] A. Borodin, A. Okounkov and G. Olshanski, Asymptotics of Plancherel measures for symmetric groups, *Journal of American Mathematical Society*, **13** (2000), pp. 491–515. arXiv:math/9905032.

[BO] A. Borodin and G. Olshanski, The Young bouquet and its boundary, *Moscow Mathematical Journal*, **13** Issue 2 (2013), pp. 193-232. arXiv:1110.4458.

[BP] A. Borodin, L. Petrov, Integrable probability: From representation theory to Macdonald processes, *Probability Surveys* **11** (2014), pp. 1–58. arXiv:1310.8007.

[DV] D. Daley and D. Vere-Jones, An introduction to the theory of point processes: Vol. I. Elementary theory and methods, Springer–Verlag, New York, 2003.

[D] M. Defosseux, Orbit measures, random matrix theory and interlaced determinantal processes, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Probab. Stat.* **46**(1) (2010), pp. 209–249.

[DM] E. Duse, A. Metcalfe, Asymptotic geometry of discrete interlaced patterns: Part I. arXiv:1412.6653.

[EG] P. Edelman and C. Greene, Balanced tableaux, *Advances in Mathematics* **63**(1) (1987), pp. 42–99.

[FN] P. J. Forrester and E. Nordenstam, The anti-symmetric GUE minor process, *Moscow Mathematical Journal* **9**(4) (2009), pp. 749–774.

[HY] Z. Hamaker, B. Young, Relating Edelman-Greene insertion to the Little map, *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics* **40**(3) (2014), pp. 693–710. arXiv:1210.7119.

[J] K. Johansson, Discrete orthogonal polynomial ensembles and the Plancherel measure, *Annals of Mathematics*, **153** no. 2 (2001), pp. 259–296. arXiv:math/9906120.

[KV] M. Kotowski, B. Viràg. Limits of random permuton processes and large deviations for the interchange process, in preparation.

[La] P. D. Lax, Functional Analysis, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2002.

[Le] A. Lenard, Correlation functions and the uniqueness of the state in classical statistical mechanics, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **30** (1973), pp. 35–44.

[N] M. Nica, Decorated Young Tableaux and the Poissonized Robinson-Schensted Process, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 127, no. 2 (2017), 449–474. arXiv:1404.4015

[O] A. Okounkov. Random matrices and random permutations. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, **20** (2000), pp. 1043–1095.

[P] L. Petrov, Asymptotics of random lozenge tilings via Gelfand-Tsetlin schemes, *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **160**(3) (2014), pp. 429–487.

[RVV] M. Rahman, B. Virág, Máté Vizer, Geometry of Permutation Limits, arXiv:1609.03891.

[Ro] A. Rozinov, Statistics of Random Sorting Networks, PhD Thesis, Courant Institute, NYU, 2016.

[S] R. P. Stanley, On the number of reduced decompositions of elements of Coxeter groups, *European Journal of Combinatorics* **5**(4) (1984), pp. 359–372.

[Wa] C. Walck, Hand-book on statistical distributions for experimentalists, 1996. Available at `http://www.fysik.su.se/~walck/suf9601.pdf`.

[Wi] H. Widom, The asymptotics of a continuous analogue of orthogonal polynomials, *Journal of Appoximation Theory* **77** (1994), pp. 51–64.

Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA and Institute for Information Transmission Problems of Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia.
E-mail address: `vadicgor@gmail.com`

Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA
E-mail address: `mustazee@mit.edu`